

Online Research @ Cardiff

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/85765/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Pons-Sanz, Sara M. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8752-0652> 2015.
Norse-derived terms in Orm's lexico-semantic field of EMOTION. Journal of English and Germanic Philology 114 (4) , pp. 552-586.
10.5406/jenglgermphil.114.4.0552 file

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/0.5406/jenglgermphil.114.4.0552>
<<http://dx.doi.org/0.5406/jenglgermphil.114.4.0552>>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies.

See

<http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



Norse-Derived Terms in Orm's Lexico-Semantic Field of EMOTION

Sara M. Pons-Sanz

1. INTRODUCTION

The *Ormulum* is an early Middle English work of biblical exegesis. It was initially intended to provide a commentary on all the Gospel extracts used in the mass throughout the year, starting from the Christmas season; however, it was never finished, running out after thirty homilies and lasting for 20,000 lines, about an eighth of the original plan.¹ Scholars are generally dismissive about its literary interest, to the extent that Millward tells us that, “as literature, the result is worthless,”² and Burnley characterizes the fact that we only have a fraction of the initial plan as “merciful.”³ Its style is often said to be tedious, monotonous, boring and diffuse.⁴ In fact, one can be doubtful about whether the text actually reached a contemporary audience, as it is only preserved in a manuscript that is likely to be an autograph (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 1), although Jan van Vliet, a seventeenth-century owner of the Junius manuscript, copied some extracts in London, Lambeth Palace, MS 783.⁵

The language of the text is a different matter, though, as linguists have recognized for quite some time its value not only in connection with its innovative phonetic spelling system,⁶ but also as a source of data for the late twelfth-century South Lincolnshire dialect,⁷ the East Midlands dialects in general being rather underrepresented in the early stages of the English language. As is widely known, Lincolnshire was one of the Five Boroughs of Scandinavian settlement, thus at the very heart of the area of Scandinavian influence.⁸ Indeed, together with the text's spelling system, the influence of Old Norse is one of the text's linguistic issues most frequently discussed in the literature. Norse influence has been identified in connection with both syntax and vocabulary, at the level of individual words and phraseology.⁹ That the vocabulary of this text was heavily Scandinavianized

was already recognized at the end of the nineteenth century, Brate's study being the main work on the Norse-derived terms in the text.¹⁰ Subsequent lexical studies have taken Brate's work as the starting point, and have explored some of Orm's frequent doublets including native and borrowed terms. Thus, for example, Hille analyzes the distribution of ME *til* (cp. OIc *til*) and *to*,¹¹ while Johannesson explores the factors that trigger the choice between the Scandinavian and the native third person plural personal pronouns in the text (see further below, 3.1).¹² It is, however, difficult to find studies on whole lexico-semantic fields in this text, a notable exception being an analysis by Johannesson on the make-up of the field of BREAD.¹³ The present paper follows along the lines of these studies, revising first the evidence for Norse derivation of various terms associated with the lexico-semantic field of EMOTION and discussing later the semantic and stylistic relations between these terms and the native members of the field, which have been identified in the main with the help of the *Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary* (hereafter *HTOED*) and the glossary included in Holt's edition of the text.¹⁴ This is the most recent edition we have, but it is clearly inaccurate in many respects.¹⁵ Accordingly, the manuscript has also been consulted at times.

2. IDENTIFICATION OF THE NORSE-DERIVED TERMS BELONGING TO THE LEXICO-SEMANTIC FIELD OF EMOTION IN THE *ORMULUM*

Formal evidence provides the most reliable data that we can take into consideration in order to identify Norse-derived terms in medieval English texts, although not all formal evidence is equally conclusive.¹⁶ Particularly strong is the evidence deriving from the phonological structure of a word when it exhibits an evolution that is unexpected for Old English but tallies particularly well with what we would expect in Old Norse. That is the case for the following words in the *Ormulum*:

I. Vowels

1) PGmc */ai/ > OE /a:/ vs OIc /ei/ (cp. VAN /ai/)¹⁷

a) ME *baiten* (<bezztenn>) ‘to harass, torment’:¹⁸ even though Brate argues in favour of associating this term with **bi-hezztenn* (cp. OIc *heit* ‘threatening words or gestures, threats’),¹⁹ it is probably better to follow Egge and Björkman in identifying it as a loanword based on the Viking Age Norse term represented by OIc *beita* ‘to cause to bite, hunt’, used figuratively in Orm’s text.²⁰ The presence of the diphthong in the root is a clear indicator of its Norse origin, the native cognate of the verb being OE *bāetan* ‘to bait, hunt, worry’, which exhibits the common i-umlauted reflex of the monophthongized Proto-Germanic diphthong (cp. PGmc **baitjan-* and OHG *beizen* ‘to motivate, try’).²¹

b) ME *-leik* (<-lezzc>): the presence of the diphthong in this suffix provides firm evidence in favour of identifying it as the Norse cognate of the native OE *-lāc*.²² Notably, many of the nouns that have this suffix in the text have equivalents with the native ME *-nesse*, their alternation being in the main dictated by metrical reasons: Burchfield points out that the Norse-derived suffix is preferred when a monosyllabic suffix is required by the metre, while the native ME *-nesse* is used when a dissyllabic form is necessary.²³ This distinction is one that Orm normalized across the manuscript, with all thirty-four cases of the monosyllabic native variant <-niss> before l. 7524 having been replaced with *-leik*, despite the fact that, up to that point, <-niss> was four times as frequent as the foreign suffix. The distinction between ME *-nesse* and *-leik* has given rise to the development of a number of abstract nouns unattested elsewhere, some of which belong to the lexico-semantic field of EMOTION: see, for instance, the *MED*’s entries for the following terms: *edmōdlege* ‘humility’ (<æddmodlezzc>), *grimmelezzc* ‘cruelty’, *grimmcunndlezzc* ‘cruelty’, *mētlezc* ‘humility’, *mīldhertelezc* ‘mercy’ and *mōdizlezc* ‘pride’. Some of them have equivalents in Old Norse (cp. OIc *grimmleikr* ‘cruelty’); however, it is not easy to determine whether these terms should be understood as loanwords or as new-formations by Orm, just like those without Norse equivalents. Because these terms are simply by-forms of *-nesse* derivatives, their lexico-semantic subfield will not be studied here unless it includes other Norse-derived terms.²⁴

c) ME *wei* (<waz̥z̥>) ‘misery, trouble, woe’: the presence of the diphthong in this noun could be taken as evidence of its Norse origin (cp. OIc *vei* ‘woe’ and OE *wā* id.),²⁵ although it could also be the case that the diphthong might be explained as a result of the fact that the term goes back to an interjection and these words do not always follow the expected phonological developments (cp. OE *weilawei* in the mid-tenth century manuscript London, British Library, MS Cotton Otho A.vi, which records Alfred’s translation of Boethius’s *Consolation of Philosophy*).²⁶

2) PGmc */e:/ > NWGmc */a:/ > WS and Kt. /æ:/ and Angl. /e:/ (or /o:/ when followed by a nasal) vs OIc /a:/²⁷

a) ME *brōth* (<brap̥>) ‘angry’: the presence of /a:/ in Orm’s adjective (further suggested by the fact that it was spelt <braith, brayth> in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Scots),²⁸ instead of the expected /e:/, suggests that it should be derived from the Viking Age Norse term represented by OIc *bráðr* ‘sudden, hasty’, with the metaphoric meaning ‘hot tempered’ (cp., possibly, OE *bræd* ‘roasted meat’ and *brædan* ‘to cook, grill’; see below, [II.3.a](#) in this section).²⁹ This term is the basis for the English new-formation ME *bratthe* (<brap̥pe>) ‘impetuosity, violence, wrath, ire’, which includes the Old English suffix *-þo / -þu / -þ*. ME *bratthe* might have been coined by analogy with OE *wræððo* ‘anger’, which has the same structure and similar meaning (cp. OE *wrāð* ‘furious’).

b) ME *louen* ‘to make low; to humble’ (<lah̥zhenn>): this verb is an English new-formation based on the adjective ME *loue* ‘low’ (<lḁzhe>). The presence of <a> in Orm’s spellings indicates that this adjective should be understood as a reflex of the Viking Age Norse term represented by OIc *lágr* ‘low’ (< PGmc *lēgu- or *lēga-, this being a lengthened grade of PGmc *leg(j)an-*). Heidermanns and Kroonen note that some West Germanic languages have reflexes of this root; however, they represent a *-ja-* stem (cp. OFris. *lēch*, *leich* ‘low’ and MHG *læge* id.).³⁰

c) ME *radde* (<radd>) ‘frightened, afraid’: this term has to be treated together with the previous ones because they share the same phonological reason for their identification as Norse-derived terms (cp. OIc *hræddr* ‘frightened, afraid’), although the terms differ in that the root vowel of this adjective has

followed the same path as native Old English words and has been shortened because of the presence of the double consonant.³¹

d) ME *wandreth* (<wanndrap>) ‘misery, distress, hardship’: the second component of Orm’s word (<-rap>) points very clearly towards its Norse origin, not only because of the vowel but also because of the final consonant (see below, [II.3.b](#) in this section). Thus, it should be associated with the Viking Age Norse term represented by OIc *ráð* ‘counsel’ (cp. OE *rād* id.), rather than with the determinatum of the term represented by OIc *vandræði* ‘difficulty, trouble’, which is made up by OIc *vandr* ‘difficult, hard’ and OIc *ræði* ‘rule, management’ (cp. OE *rāden* ‘condition’).³²

II. Consonants

1) Consonant assimilation

a) ME *apermōd* (<appermod>) ‘bitterness of heart’: although the term reads <awwermod> in Holt’s edition,³³ Burchfield explains that the correct reading is <appermod> and that it should therefore be interpreted as a new-formation with the Viking Age Norse term represented by OIc *apr* ‘hard, sharp’ as its determinant and the native ME *mōd* ‘mood, mind’ as its determinatum.³⁴ The reason for assuming a Norse origin for the first component of the compound is the fact that it exhibits the typical Norse process of assimilation */mp/ > /pp/ (cp. PGmc **ampraR* and MDu. *amper* ‘sour, bitter, harsh’).³⁵

b) ME *sīte* (<sit>) ‘grief, sorrow’: this noun is commonly associated with the Viking Age Norse term represented by OIc *sút* ‘grief, sorrow’, although an additional explanation is needed to account for the different vowel, such as the existence of an unattested Norse by-form with /y:/ (cp. Norw. *syt* ‘whimpering, whining’) or the influence of the verb belonging to the same word-field (cp. OIc *sýta* ‘to afflict, regret’).³⁶ One issue that has led to this association (besides formal similarity) is the fact that the term collocates in the *Ormulum* and in various Northern and North Midland texts with ME *sorwe*, a collocation that is likely to have been modelled on the Old West Norse phrase *sorg ok súit*

(see below, 3.2.2). Thus, this term, like the previous one, might exhibit a typically Norse process of consonantal assimilation, in this case */xt/ > /tt/ (cp. PGmc **suxtiz*).³⁷

2) PGmc */sk-/ > OE [ʃ-] vs VAN /sk-/³⁸

a) ME *skerren* (<skerrenn>) ‘to frighten, terrify’: it is not clear whether this term should be interpreted as a loanword based on the Viking Age Norse verb represented by OIc *skirra* ‘to bar, prevent’ (cp. OIc *skirrask* ‘to shun, shrink from’, Norw. *skjerra* ‘to scare’, dial. Swed. *skjarra* ‘to scare’),³⁹ or as an English new-formation on the basis of ME *skerre* ‘excitable, easily frightened or provoked’ (cp. OIc *skjarr* ‘timid, shy’).⁴⁰ In either case, the presence of the cluster /sk/ instead of the palatal fricative /ʃ/ can be taken as a proof of the Norse origin of the verb because in Old English the cluster became palatalized in initial position in front of both front and back vowels.

3) PGmc *[-ð-] > OE /-d-/ vs OIc [-ð-] (/θ-/⁴¹

a) ME *brōth* (<brap>) ‘angry’: given that *[ð], whether originating from PIE */d^h/ or as a result of PGmc */θ/ (< PIE */t/) having been affected by Verner’s Law, is always occluded in West Germanic, whereas in North Germanic it tends to remain as a fricative (unless it appears in initial position or after a nasal or liquid consonant, or unless it is geminated), the presence of the final fricative in this adjective should be added to the nature of the root vowel as evidence in favour of its Norse origin (cp., possibly, OE *bræd* ‘roasted meat’ and *brædan* ‘to cook, grill’; see above, 1.2.a in this section).

b) ME *wandreth* (<wanndrap>) ‘misery, distress, hardship’: similarly, the presence of the fricative consonant at the end of this word (cp. PIE **Hreh₁d^h-*) can be taken as evidence in favour of its Norse origin (cp. above, 1.2.d in this section).⁴²

On other occasions, it is not the phonological but the morphological structure of the word that points towards its foreign origin. That is the case for ME *aue* (<aʒhe>) ‘immediate and active fear; terror, dread’: the initial vowel and the velar consonant indicate that the verb cannot be a reflex of the native OE *ege* ‘fear, terror, dread’, a strong noun (< PGmc **agiz-*, cp. Goth. *agis* id.) which exhibits the expected effects of i-umlaut and palatalization of the original velar (cp. ME <eʒze> in

the *Ormulum*).⁴³ The term should instead be interpreted as a loan from the Viking Age Norse weak noun with similar meaning represented by OIc *agi* (< PGmc **agan-*; cp. OHG *agī*, *egī* id. < PGmc **agin-*).⁴⁴ The derivative ME *aueful* (< *aʒhefull*>) ‘awe-inspiring; terrible’ is likely to be a new-formation coined by analogy with OE *egeful* ‘inspiring or feeling fear or awe’.⁴⁵

Sometimes there is nothing in the formal structure of the word pointing towards its foreign origin, but various issues associated with its attestation can be suggestive of Norse derivation: e.g. the distribution of the root in the Germanic languages (particularly, when the term is common in Old Norse but is not attested elsewhere other than in English), the chronological and dialectal distribution of the term in English (especially, when the term is first attested in late Old English or in Middle English texts originating from the Scandinavianized areas) and the initial attestation of the term in connection with the Scandinavian newcomers and their practices. It is this type of (unreliable) evidence that we need to invoke in order to include ME *angren* (< *anngrenn*>) ‘to distress, trouble, vex’ in the list of Norse loans recorded in the *Ormulum*: although there are various Indo-European languages that have words associated with the root of this verb, viz. PIE *h₂emg^h*- (cp. Sanskrit *āṃhas-* ‘distress, trouble’ and L *angor* ‘suffocation, anxiety’), as far as the Germanic languages are concerned, the root is only attested in the Scandinavian languages (OIc *angra* ‘to grieve, vex’ and *angr* ‘trouble, affliction’, Far. *angur* ‘repentance, remorse’ and Elf. *aungger* ‘sorry’) and English.⁴⁶

A Norse origin for ME *mēk* ‘meek, humble, gentle’ (< *meoc*>; cp. OIc *mjúkr* ‘soft, agile; meek’) could also be claimed on the basis of the association of its root with the Scandinavian languages, as the Proto-Germanic root this adjective is a reflex of (viz. PGmc **meuk-*) is only recorded in languages descending from North Germanic (e.g. Far. *mjúkur*, Swed. *mjuk*, Dan. *myg*). However, we should bear in mind that reflexes of its by-form PGmc **mūk-* are attested in other Germanic languages (cp. Go. *muka-modei* ‘gentleness’ and MDu. *muyck* ‘soft, mellow’). The fact that the adjective is first attested in early Middle English texts might also point towards Norse derivation, but its dialectal distribution is not particularly suggestive of a foreign origin because it is very widely

used already in those texts.⁴⁷ That the adjective was well-integrated in English is further indicated by its frequent participation in word-formation processes; in the *Ormulum* we find, besides the adjective, many other members of its word-field: ME *mēken* ‘to bring low; to humble’, *mēklāc* ‘humility’ (<meoclezzc>; cp. OIc *mjúkleikr*), *mēklī* ‘humbly, obediently’ (cp. OIc *mjúkliga* ‘softly, tenderly’), *mēknesse* ‘humility’ and *unmēk* ‘savage, fierce, rude, aggressive’ (cp. OIc *úmjúkr* ‘unsoft, harsh’).

Unlike the roots of the previous two terms, the root of the derivative ME *forglopped* (<forrgloppnedd>) ‘badly frightened’, which is likely to be an English new-formation, is not clearly restricted to the Scandinavian languages because its relationship with verbs such as OFris. *glūpa* ‘to look’, MLG *glūpen* ‘to cast a secret look with half-opened eyes’ and Du. *gluipen* ‘to watch slyly, sneak’ is not fully clear, although they are likely to be related.⁴⁸ Therefore, the only reason to consider this term as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *glúpna* ‘to be surprised, look downcast’) is the fact that its root is first attested in Middle English texts originating from the areas where the Scandinavians settled down, while the derivative is only recorded in the *Ormulum* and the *Cursor Mundi*.⁴⁹ We might also want to consider that fact that verbs with the *-n-* formative are much more common in Old Norse than in Old English, although the formative is not unknown in the latter.⁵⁰ Björkman gives the Norse origin of the term as “questionable,” though, because of the lack of attestation of an Old Norse term with <o> (but cp. dial. Norw. *glopen* ‘greedy’ and *glopa* ‘to gape, devour’).⁵¹ However, Brate explains the vocalic variation by comparison with OE *lūcan* ‘to lock, close’, past part. *locen*.⁵²

Similarly, the facts that ME *gōlīke* (<golike>) ‘joyful (?)’ is only recorded in the *Ormulum* and that it does not have a dental consonant at the end of the root (cp. ME *gōdlī* ‘excellent, good’ <OE *gōdlīc* id.) are the main factors in favour of attributing it a foreign origin (cp. OIc *góligr* ‘fine, pretty’, probably from **góðligr*).⁵³ As was the case with other Norse-derived adjectives (cp. ME <storlic> ‘strong, great’, cp. OIc *stórligr* id.),⁵⁴ the native derivative suffix seems to have replaced its Norse cognate. The absence of palatalization in the suffix could be the result of Anglo-Scandinavian

linguistic contact (cp. OIc *-líkr*), but could also be attributed to the existence of non-palatalized forms in the comparative and superlative degrees of the native suffix (OE *-licra*, *-licost*).⁵⁵

The Norse derivation of ME *rōs* (<ros>) ‘a boast’, *rōsen* (<rosenn>) ‘to boast, brag’ and the new-formation *rōsinge* (<rosinng>) ‘boasting, pride’ (cp. OIc *hrós* ‘praise’ and *hrósa* ‘to praise’) is also suggested in the main by the distribution of the word-field both in Middle English and Present-Day English, as well as the fact that the Scandinavian forms (cp. OSwed. *rōs*, *rōsa*, ODan. *ros*, *rose*, Norw. *ros*, *rosa*, etc.) are the only Germanic ones which have the formative PGmc **-s-* (cp. OHG *hrōd* ‘praise’, OS *hrōð* id., OIc *hróðr* id., OE *hrōðor* ‘consolation, pleasure’, Goth. *hrōþeigs* ‘glorious’, etc.).⁵⁶

3. THE INTEGRATION OF THE NORSE-DERIVED TERMS IN THE LEXICO-SEMANTIC FIELD OF EMOTION

3.1 ORM’S LEXICAL CHOICES

Before we start analyzing in detail the semantic and stylistic relationships between the Norse-derived terms referring to EMOTION and their native (near-)synonyms in the *Ormulum*, it is important to review some of the factors that past scholarship has identified as influencing Orm’s lexical choices:

1) Semantics: As one might expect, semantics is a very significant factor behind Orm’s selection of a particular member of a lexico-semantic field. Thus, for instance, Johannesson points out in connection with the distribution of the field of BREAD in the *Ormulum* that “LAF [‘unit of production, loaf’] and KEHELL [< OE *coecil* ‘little cake’] stand in a unit-of relationship to BRÆD [‘bread as a substance’], and *CRUMME [< OE *cruma* ‘crumb’] stands in a meronymic relationship to the other three.”⁵⁷

2) Tradition: On some occasions Orm followed lexical traditions and maintained well-established collocations.⁵⁸ For instance, Rynell shows that the Norse-derived ME *taken* ‘to take’ was well advanced in the process of ousting its native synonym ME *nimen* in Orm’s idiolect (340x vs 33x occurrences, respectively).⁵⁹ Yet, Rynell notes that on twenty-one occasions ME *nimen* collocates with ME *gōme*, a Norse loan meaning ‘attention, heed’ (cp. OIc *gaumr*).⁶⁰ This phrase is modelled on the native ME *nimen yēme*,⁶¹ which records the native synonym of the Norse noun (< OE *gȳme*). However, Orm does not follow the same practice as far as the native idiom OE *bysne niman be / æt* ‘to take example by / from’ is concerned, for he only uses ME *nimen* in one context to express the meaning of the idiom and he replaces it with the Norse-derived synonym ME *taken* on eight occasions. In some contexts (e.g. ll. 14696 and 14920), the presence of the loan might have been triggered by Orm’s desire to avoid repetition, as the collocation ME *nimen gōme* is recorded only a couple of lines before (ll. 14694 and 14918). As Rynell explains,⁶² medieval writers had to deal with two opposing tendencies: “repetition, largely unintentional, and variation, mainly intentional.”⁶³ We also need to remember that it is not only English collocations that Orm was familiar with. Thus, some of his choices were also influenced by Norse lexical patterns: for instance, the use of ME *taken* instead of ME *nimen* in the alliterative collocation with ME *trouen* ‘to have trust’ (l. 16689; it collocates with ME *treuth* ‘faith’ in l. 2864) might mirror the Old East Norse expression *taka ok tróa*.⁶⁴

3) Metrical demands: Orm followed fairly strict metrical rules in the composition of his text and it is likely to be the case that, in some contexts, the metrical constraints that he had imposed on his work led him to choose a particular word (at times a less prominent word in his idiolect) instead of a (near-)synonym.⁶⁵ For instance, Dance explains that

æ [a native term meaning ‘law’] only appears at the end of the first hemistich of Orm’s septenarius line, immediately before the caesura, where the metre demands a stressed syllable.

This is the one position that *la3he* [the Norse-derived synonym of *æ*], a disyllabic word with an elidable final vowel cannot fill, and Orm (with typical regularity) never uses it there.⁶⁶

Thus, metrical demands explain the only three occurrences of ME *ē* (*æ* in Dance's quotation) in a text where the Norse-derived ME *laue* (*la3he* in Dance's quotation) is clearly dominant.

4) Phonology: Dance's comment already hints at what Johannesson calls the *Hiatus Avoidance Principle*, viz. "[a]void vowel hiatus at word boundaries within the verse section,"⁶⁷ and it is this principle that lies behind many choices between the native third person plural set of pronouns and their Norse-derived equivalents: "the use of *þe33m* can be wholly, and that of *þe3re* partly, explained by the need for a pronoun form that did not begin in *h* + vowel" (see also above, note 57).⁶⁸

On a different but related note, the repetitive nature of ME *name nam* 'took a name' might have led Orm to prefer *name tōc* instead.⁶⁹ In other contexts, though, it is precisely the repetitive or echoic character of a collocation that seems to have made it appealing to Orm (e.g. the doublet *grith and frith* in ll. 3926, 3940, etc., made up by two (near-)synonyms referring to PEACE with different etymologies: ME *grith*, a Norse-derived term, cp. OIc *grið* pl. 'truce, peace', which is the main word used by Orm to refer to this concept, and ME *frith*, the reflex of OE *frið*, which only occurs in conjunction with *grith* in the *Ormulum*).⁷⁰

3.2 ORM'S LEXICAL CHOICES TO EXPRESS EMOTION

The terms identified in section 2 are clustered mainly around two semantic areas within the lexico-semantic field of EMOTION: MENTAL PAIN, SUFFERING (ME *angren*, *baiten*, *sīte*, *wandreth* and *wei*; *HTOED*, 02.02.20) and FEAR (ME *aue*, *aueful*, *forglopned*, *radde* and *skerren*; *HTOED*, 02.02.30).⁷¹

The remaining terms refer to PLEASURE, ENJOYMENT (ME *gōlīke*; *HTOED*, 02.02.19), ANGER (ME *brōth* and *bratthe*, besides *grimmele33c* and *grimmcunndle33c*; *HTOED*, 02.02.21), HATRED, ENMITY (ME *apermōd*; *HTOED*, 02.02.23),⁷² PRIDE (ME *rōs*, *rōsen* and *rōsinge*, besides *mōdizle33c*; *HTOED*,

02.02.28), and HUMILITY (ME *mēk*, *mēken*, *mēklāc*, *mēklī* and *mēknesse*, besides *edmōdlege* and *mētlegc*; *HTOED* 02.02.29). Thus, most of the terms indicate negative concepts. This is in keeping with Wehna's point that "among quite a significant number of Scandinavian loanwords one can find numerous words with slightly or strongly negative connotations,"⁷³ although it is difficult to accept as a reason for this that "[t]he Vikings must have been viewed as invaders bringing destruction and disasters of all kinds."⁷⁴ We need to remember that, after the period of initial hit-and-run attacks, a significant number of Scandinavians settled down among their Anglo-Saxons neighbours, married native women and fairly quickly took on many of the customs and the language of their new environment. Moreover, it is debatable to what extent Old English speakers would have identified these words as clearly Norse-derived. It is equally difficult to accept straightforwardly that "finding [in Present-Day English] a high frequency pair containing a positive Scandinavian item contrasting with a negative English counterpart seems a vain effort."⁷⁵ We do not need to look any further than PDE *happy* (cp. OIc *happ* 'chance, good luck, success') and PDE *sad* (< OE *sæd*). In any case, the predominance of negative terms is certainly notable.

The subsections below explore the factors that might have influenced Orm's lexical choices. The order of the lexico-semantic subfields under discussion follows the *HTOED*.

3.2.1 PLEASURE, ENJOYMENT (*HTOED*, 02.02.19)

The *HTOED* records ME *gōlike* in section 02.02.19.08, adj., together with other adjectives meaning 'joyful, delighted', and in section 02.02.19.10, adj., with adjectives meaning 'merry'. More often than not Orm refers to the concepts of JOYFULNESS and MERRIMENT with members of the ME *blisse* word-field and he sometimes brings together some of the terms that make up the field: e.g. ll. 6428 and 6429 join ME *blīthe* 'joyful, merry' and *blisse* 'happiness, joyfulness', while l. 18444 records ME *blīthe* and *blissen* 'to be full of joy'. This word-field is so dominant that the use of the members

of the near-synonymous ME *gladshipe* word-field (except for the adverb ME *gladlī*) is in the main restricted to contexts where they collocate with members of the more common word-field (ll. 160, 784, 793, 3179 and 15341), a union which goes back to Old English and which exemplifies Orm's continuation of earlier lexical choices.

ME *gōlike* is only recorded on two occasions, in very close proximity (ll. 15662 and 15665, part of Homily xxiv), referring first to Capernaum (the only mention of the city in the text) and then to our world, which is compared to the city:

Forr affterr þatt soþ boc uss sezẏþ
Cafarnaum bitacneþþ
Golike tun, 7 scone tun
7 fazzerr to bihaldenn,
7 swille iss all þiss middellærd
Golike, 7 scone, 7 fazzerr
Till alle þa þatt lufenn itt;
Forr hemm itt þinnkeþþ scone,
Forrþi þatt teẏz ne þennkenn nohht
Off heffness ærdess blisse,
7 forrþi þinnkeþþ hemm full god
7 luffsumm her to libbenn,
To follghenn þezẏre flæshess lusst
I maniz kinne sinne. (ll. 15660-70)

(‘Because afterwards that truthful book tells us that Capernaum means “*gōlike* town and beautiful town, and pretty to behold”, and all this world is similar, *gōlike*, beautiful and pretty, to all those who love it: for it seems to them beautiful because they do not think about heaven’s

bliss, and because it seems to them very good and pleasant to live here, to follow the pleasure of their flesh in many types of sin.’)⁷⁶

The interpretation of this adjective is somewhat problematic and, in order to come to grips with it, we need to know the sources that Orm used when composing this homily, which relies on John 2:12-25.⁷⁷ While in the past much effort was spent in demonstrating that Orm relied mainly on one particular source throughout the whole of the *Ormulum* (e.g. Bede’s works, in the case of Sarrazin; and the *Glossa Ordinaria et Interlinearis*, in the case of Matthes),⁷⁸ recent scholarship has shown that Orm had at his disposal a very wide array of sources and used many when composing individual homilies.⁷⁹ Johannesson points out that the ninth-century text *Commentarius in Evangelium Johannis* by the Irish monk Johannes Scotus Eurigena was a very significant source for the homilies based on John’s Gospel. However, Eurigena’s text had some lacunae (including his commentary on John 1:30-2:25) and Orm relied on a number of alternative sources when faced with them.⁸⁰ Johannesson identifies the following works as the sources for Homily xxiv:⁸¹

Paul the Diacon, *Homiliarius*, Homily xcvi (PL vol. 95) (79%)⁸²

Glossa Ordinaria (PL vol. 114) (17%)

Bede, *In S. Joannis Euangelium Expositio* (PL vol. 92) (13%)

St Augustine, *In Joannis Evangelium Tractatus CXXIV* (PL vol. 35) (8%)

Uncertain source (20%)

Both the *Glossa Ordinaria* (col. 122, interpretation of Matthew 11:23) and Bede’s commentary on John’s Gospel (col. 662) record a common interpretation of Capernaum as “villa pulcherrima” (‘most beautiful town’), and Bede’s text even includes the association of the town with this world:

“Capharnaum vero villa pulcherrima interpretatur, significans hunc mundum” (‘Capernaum is truly interpreted as most beautiful town, meaning this world’), which might lead us to suggest that this is likely to have been Orm’s main source for this part of the exegesis.⁸³ In this respect, and given the

meaning of the Norse term that ME *gōlike* is commonly associated with (viz. ‘fine, pretty’; see above, 2), it might be the case that the adjective should be studied in connection with others referring to BEAUTY (cp. *HTOED*, 02.04.05, adj.) and that, therefore, it is a near-synonym of ME *shēne* ‘beautiful, bright’ and *fair* id., the two adjectives it appears with in its two attestations in the *Ormulum*. Thus, ‘shewy, grand’, the meaning that the adjective is attributed in the glossary that accompanies Holt’s edition,⁸⁴ might be more appropriate than ‘joyful, gay’, the meaning that both the *MED* and the *OED* give for this adjective without any explanation.⁸⁵ We should bear in mind, though, that in Bede’s commentary the beauty of the world is explained on the basis that, by the mystery of the Incarnation, God manifested Himself to the world, not in connection with people’s fleshly desires and sins, as in the case in the *Ormulum*. Orm might have been influenced here by an unidentified source, as none of the other sources mentioned by Johannesson presents a better match.⁸⁶

Should we want to look for some evidence in favour of the meaning that the two historical dictionaries give for this adjective, we could suggest that the presentation of Capernaum as a joyful town might be a reference to the important role that it played in Jesus’s Galilean teaching (see Matthew 11:23).⁸⁷ More stretched because of the semantic difference is the association of the adjective with an alternative—probably correct—interpretation of *Capernaum* as ‘field or house of comfort’:⁸⁸ e.g. *Onomastica Sacra*,⁸⁹ Jerome’s *Liber de Nominibus Hebraicis* (a.k.a. *Liber Interpretationis Hebraicorum Nominum*; “Cafarnaum ager uel uilla consolationis,” ‘Capernaum field or town of comfort’),⁹⁰ and Bede’s *In Matthæi Evangelium Expositio* (*PL* vol. 92, col. 21). Jerome’s *Tractatus in Marci Euangelium* provides a link between consolation and enjoyment, and includes as well the common reference to Capernaum as a beautiful place:

Capharnaum: [...] agrum consolationis. CAPHAR enim dicitur ager, NAVM dicitur consolatio.

Si autem uolumus Naum — quoniam lingua habraea multiples habet intellegentias, et

secundum diuersitatem pronuntiantis diuersus quoque sensus efficitur — Naum ergo et consolatio dicitur, et decorus. Ergo Capharnaum interpretari potest et ager consolationis et ager pulcherrimus. Ibi ubi nos legimus “Ecce quam bonum et quam iocundum”: ubi, inquam, nos dicimus *τερπνόν*, et Auila interpretatur *εὐπρεπές*, in hebraeo habetur NAVM, quod interpretatur pulchrum.⁹¹

(‘Capernaum: field of comfort. *Capar* indeed means “field,” *naum* means “comfort.” In fact, if we want to, *naum*—given that in the Hebrew language it has various meanings, and a varied sense is also developed following a diversity of pronunciation—*naum* therefore also means both “comfort” and “elegant.” Therefore, you can interpret Capernaum both as “field of comfort” and “field most beautiful.” There, where we read “Behold how good and how pleasant,” where, that is to say, we mentioned *τερπνόν*, and Auila translated it as *εὐπρεπές*, in Hebrew *naum* is used, which is translated as “beautiful”.’)

In any case, it is clearly harder to see the connection between the name of the city and JOYFULNESS. Yet, maybe, the adjective should not be associated simply with JOYFULNESS and MERRIMENT but with VEHEMENT OR PASSIONATE DESIRE, and it might be attributed the meaning ‘lustful’ (*HTOED*, 03.05.05.07.02.01, adj.). This interpretation is suggested by the context where the adjective appears. Once Orm has told us about the various ways in which we can interpret the name of the city, he explains that the same adjectives can be applied to the earth, which seems lovely and enjoyable to the men who, not caring for eternal bliss, simply follow “þeʒʒre flæshess lusst / I maniz kinne sinne” (‘the pleasure of their flesh in many types of sin’; ll. 15672-73). Indeed, the association of the town with excess is presented in the Bible itself, as it is compared with Sodom (Matthew 11:23). The anonymous *Enarrationes in Matthæi Evangelium*, which Morrison identifies as having a prominent position among Orm’s sources,⁹² refers to the excesses of its citizens in its interpretation of the name: “Capharnaum pulcherrima villa interpretatur, quæ miraculis Domini coruscavit, sed

nomen suum in contrarium sibi cessit, dum in infidelitate permansit” (‘Capernaum is interpreted as “most beautiful town,” which trembled with the miracles of the Lord, but its name became contrary to itself, while it remained in infidelity’; *PL* vol. 162, col. 1354). The Norse-derived adjective might have undergone pejoration because of its association with the similar OE *gāllīc* > ME *gōllīch* ‘lustful’, an adjective belonging to a word-field that Orm uses a few times (see ll. 1192, 1201, etc.). The link between JOYFULNESS and PASSIONATE DESIRE, probably perceived as a case of JOYFULNESS taken one step too far, can be seen in some adjectives: consider, for instance, PDE *gay* and *jolly*.⁹³ Because Orm is the only English author to use this term (as far as we know), it is difficult to know with any level of certainty what the correct meaning of the word might be.

3.2.2 MENTAL PAIN, SUFFERING (*HTOED*, 02.02.20)

Orm mentions frequently the concept of SUFFERING in his work, although it is often associated either with the TORMENT OF HELL (*HTOED*, 01.07.04.07.05) or with BODILY PAIN, be it Christ’s experience on the cross (*HTOED*, 03.04.12.09) or the torment that a body undergoes due to labour, heat, cold or hunger / fasting (*HTOED*, 01.02.01.01.09). These types of SUFFERING are commonly expressed by the members of the ME *pīne* and *wō* word-fields:

- ME *pīne* word-field: TORMENT OF HELL: e.g. ll. 3683, 3863, 10563, etc.; Christ’s suffering on the cross: e.g. ll. 1367, 1371, 1377, 1442, etc; BODILY PAIN due to several factors: e.g. ll. 1614, 3733, 3742, etc.
- ME *wō* word-field: TORMENT OF HELL: e.g. 1400, 3962, 17535, 18400, etc.

Other word-fields are also used, though only occasionally: e.g. ME *throuinge* refers to Christ’s suffering on the cross in l. 15205. While the ME *pīne* word-field is very prominent in connection with BODILY PAIN and the TORMENT OF HELL, when Orm refers to MENTAL PAIN or SUFFERING (*HTOED*, 02.02.20, n.), a concept which he mentions with less frequency than BODILY PAIN, ME *wō*

takes more of a centre stage. *ME pīne* is only used on three occasions (ll. 2022, 2987 and 7928) in contexts that seem to refer to SUFFERING in general, without a clear reference to BODILY PAIN. The *ME wō* word-field is a more prominent member of the lexico-semantic field now. *ME wō* is recorded in six contexts as a reference to MENTAL SUFFERING or, sometimes more specifically, MISERY (ll. 897, 4846, 5676, 8341, 10570, 12454).⁹⁴ Notably, it appears in all these contexts bar one (l. 12454) in final position of the first hemistich, while in the two contexts where *ME pīnen* is placed in final position, viz. ll. 2022 and 7928, it occurs in the second hemistich. This points towards a division of roles similar to (albeit not as strict as) that between *ME ē* and *laue* mentioned above (3.1), and exemplifies Orm's trend towards using words in similar places throughout his text.⁹⁵

The Norse cognate of *ME wō*, viz. *ME vei*, is recorded (in the middle of the line), together with its near-synonym *ME ange*, only in l. 11904: 'himm wass waz̥ 7 ange' ('he experienced misery and pain'). The choice of this uncommon combination might have been influenced by the need of a feminine ending for the second hemistich, and the echoic effect arising from the close proximity of <waz̥> and <maz̥>, the last word of l. 11903. *ME ange* is otherwise recorded in ll. 19804 and 16289, again, as the feminine ending of the second hemistich, which makes it equivalent to *ME pīne*. Like *ME ange*, *ME pīne* appears after a word ending in a consonant in l. 2022, but not in l. 7928, where it follows the preposition *ME fra*; this might have contributed to its choice in this context, as its initial consonant would have helped to avoid elision.

In l. 4846 *ME wō* collocates with its near-synonym *ME wandreth*, in a context referring to MISERY ("Onngaen all þatt wanndraþþ 7 wa," 'against all that misery and woe'). Whereas the alliterative and somewhat conventional nature of the collocation might have facilitated the use of Norse-derived noun in this context,⁹⁶ the same cannot be said as far as l. 14825 is concerned, where the loan appears on its own. It might be that Orm chose the Norse-derived term in the second context because, like *ME wō*, it helps to develop an echoic effect with the previous line ("Whammse þu sest tatt wantsumm isst," 'whomever you see that is lacking [something]'), but, unlike *ME wō*, it has

two syllables. These are the only nouns out of those recorded by the *HTOED* (02.02.20.05, n.) referring to MISERY in the text.⁹⁷

Only on two occasions does Orm use the Norse-derived ME *sīte* to indicate MENTAL PAIN, possibly GRIEF or SORROW in particular (*HTOED*, 02.02.20.03).⁹⁸ In both contexts, ll. 4852 and 7967, the loan appears next to the noun of the word-field which he commonly chooses for the expression of this feeling, viz. ME *sorwe*.⁹⁹ This alliterative collocation, ME *sorwe and sīte*, which is widely attested in Middle English texts,¹⁰⁰ has its roots in Old Norse (cp. OIc *sorg ok sūt*),¹⁰¹ and, thus, presents us with another example of Orm's awareness and use of lexical traditions. On two occasions, ll. 4563 and 4852, ME *sorwe* is preceded by its near-synonym ME *cāre*; while the juxtaposition of these two terms does not appear to have been common either in Old or Middle English, some later Middle English sources do record it,¹⁰² which might reflect some level of familiarity with the collocation or, at the very least, Middle English authors' taste for doublets, whether alliterative or not, traditional or not.¹⁰³

With regard to the general expression of CAUSING MENTAL PAIN OR SUFFERING to someone (*HTOED*, 02.02.20.01, vt.), three verbs are of relevance in the *Ormulum*: ME *angren*, *eilen* and *pīnen*.¹⁰⁴ As noted above, ME *pīnen* tends to indicate BODILY PAIN instead; it is only recorded in two repetitive contexts, ll. 7839 and 7871, in a reference to causing suffering to one's soul, but, notably, the soul is only mentioned after the body ("hiss bodig 7 his sawle," 'his body and his soul', in ll. 7840 and 7872). ME *angren* and *eilen* are recorded twice and once, respectively, and it is difficult to see any clear difference between them, either from a semantic, phonological or metrical perspective:

Forr swa we don unnhazerrliȝ

Whattse we don to gode,

7 swa we don itt wiȝ unnskill

Ʒatt itt maȝȝ anngrenn oȝre.

Acc swa ne didenn nohht ta twa

Þatt we nu mælenn ummbe;

Forr fand mann nan þing upponn hemm

Þatt mihhte ohht anngrenn opre; (ll. 425-32)

(‘‘Because we do unsuitably whatever we do to good people, and we do it with lack of moderation so that it can afflict others. But those two that we now talk about did not do that at all, for one found nothing in them that could afflict others in any way’)

7 ȝet bilammp him operr wa

Þat mare mihhte himm eȝzlenn,

ȝiff þat he nære wæpnedd wel

Þurh þild onnȝæn unnseollþe. (ll. 4765-69)

(‘And yet another misfortune that could have troubled him more if he had not been well armed with patience against calamity happened to him.’)

In any case, Orm’s familiarity with and use of the native ME *ange* is likely to have facilitated the integration of the related Norse-derived verb into his idiolect.

One specific way of CAUSING MENTAL PAIN OR SUFFERING to someone is by HARASSING and TORMENTING him or her. Of the verbs that the *HTOED* (02.02.20.07, vt.) lists with that meaning, Orm only uses three: ME *baiten*, *bisetten* and *swenchen*. ME *swenchen* seems to be the main member of this subfield in Orm’s idiolect. It is attested on four occasions with a relevant meaning: twice in connection with one’s oppression by specific vices and immoral behaviour (ll. 12271 and 12298), once in a reference to the Devil’s general harassment of Christ’s servants (l. 12216), and once in a

context about one troubling oneself for the sake of someone else (l. 8942).¹⁰⁵ This is not surprising, as this was a very common verb in Old English. ME *baiten* is only recorded in l.10171:

We findenn upponn Latin boc
Off þise Puplicaness,
Whatt lif þeʒʒ leddenn i þe folc,
7 whatt wass heore wikenn.
Þeʒʒ haffdenn wikenn off þe king
To sammnenn hise geldess,
Þurh whamm þeʒʒ durrstenn beʒʒtenn menn
Forr æpelike gillte... (ll. 10165-72)

(‘We find out in the Latin book about these Publicans, what life they led in the region and what their duty was. They had the duty from the king to collect his taxes, because of which they dared to harass people for public offences...’)

The reason for the choice of the figurative use of this verb, associated with making animals bite, viz. ‘to bait’,¹⁰⁶ instead of the more common ME *swenchen* might be that in ll. 9743-94 Orm explains why St John the Baptist told a group of Pharisees and Sadducees that they were like vipers (Matthew 3:7) and this verb might be a continuation of the metaphor.

Orm’s use of the past participle ME *biset* ‘beset, encumbered, harassed’ in ll. 12954, 16948 and 17798 instead of either of the two aforementioned verbs might respond to the fact that in all three contexts the verb appears in connection with the effects of ME *thēsternesne* ‘darkness; absence of spiritual illumination, moral ignorance; evil, sin’, the combination of members of the two word-fields not being uncommon in Old English: e.g. “mid wealle his leahtra beset on bystrum his unryhtwysnesse byð” (‘his unrighteousness is placed in darkness with a wall of his vices’) in the

Capitula of Theodulf of Orleans.¹⁰⁷ Thus, here, as in many other cases, Orm's choice might have been, at least partially, influenced by tradition.

3.2.3 ANGER (*HTOED*, 02.20.21)

Orm refers a number of times to the concept of ANGER, in connection with both God and human beings. He seems to have preferred the members of the ME *wratthe* word-field to talk about it. Thus, the *Ormulum* records, besides ME *wratthe* and *wrōth*, on which see below, ME *wrōthen* 'to become angry; to provoke sb. to wrath or anger' (e.g. ll. 2901, 4717, 5013, etc.) and ME *wrōthlī* 'angrily' (l. 15832).

ME *wratthe*, then, is the most prevalent noun among the various terms that the *HTOED* (02.20.21, n.) records as referring to ANGER.¹⁰⁸ It sometimes occurs on its own (e.g. ll. 6910, 8136, 14793), but can also be often found in coordination with other nouns. On some occasions (frequently, though not exclusively, when referring to God's anger and punishment), the noun is paired with ME *wrēche* 'punishment, vengeance, retribution' (e.g. ll. 909, 929, 1467, 9758, etc.), which gives rise to an alliterative collocation much to Orm's taste, a collocation that does not seem to have been particularly common in either Old or Middle English. The noun collocates also frequently with ME *nīth* 'malice, spite', on its own (ll. 124, 418) or together with ME *hēte* 'an emotion of hate or intense anger, hatred' (ll. 9928, 13857, 19535, 19572, 19863), thus expanding the common co-occurrence of the latter two nouns in Old English texts, both as independent words and as part of the compound OE *nīðhete* 'hostility, evil intent'. On two occasions (ll. 5451 and 6171) the link between ANGER and HATRED or ENMITY is expressed with the union of ME *wratthe* and *lōth* 'hostility, malice' (Orm's "wrappe 7 lappe"), a rhyming collocation which, despite not being apparently common in Old English, is recorded in various other Middle English texts.¹⁰⁹

ME *erre* (Orm's <irre>) is a near-synonym of ME *wratthe* in Orm's idiolect, as suggested by the fact that it replaces it in ll. 8828 and 13857 in the collocation with ME *nīth* and *hēte*. Yet, its uses are far more restricted than those of ME *wratthe*, for eight out of its thirteen occurrences in the text are based on the use of Latin *ira* 'anger, wrath, rage' in the corresponding Gospel text: l. 9267 is part of the close rendering of Luke 3:7 ("dicebat ergo ad turbas quae exiebant ut baptizarentur ab ipso genimina viperarum quis ostendit vobis fugere a ventura ira," 'Then said he to the multitude that came forth to be baptized by him, "Oh, generation of vipers, who has warned you to flee from the wrath to come?"') in ll. 9263-69,¹¹⁰ and the occurrence of ME *erre* in ll. 9767, 9794, 9799, 9804, 9808 and 9812 can be explained on the basis that these lines are direct references to Luke's text. L. 18000, on the other hand, should be associated with John 3:36 ("qui credit in Filium habet vitam aeternam qui autem incredulus est Filio non videbit vitam sed ira Dei manet super eum," 'He who believes in the Son has everlasting life; he who does not believe in the Son will not see life, but the wrath of God abides on him').

ME *eie*, another term referring to (FURIOUS) ANGER (*HTOED*, 02.02.21.02, n.), does not tend to be paired with issues of HATRED or ENMITY. Instead, on the basis of the fact that the noun often means 'fear' (see below, 3.2.7), it tends to occur in contexts where the fear caused by someone's anger is brought to the forefront; thus, these contexts have terms referring to the two lexico-semantic subfields and ME *eie* can be said to act as a link between them. In the lines surrounding l. 7163 Orm talks about the effect that a "gram 7 grill 7 bollzhen" ('angry and fierce and enraged'; l. 7159) person like Herod has on his followers, who feel "offdredd / off himm 7 off hiss e3ze" ('frightened of him and his anger'; l. 7162-63), while in ll. 16150-53 we are told that Christ, not paying any attention to "follkess e3ze" ('the anger of the people'; l. 16151) and without any fear whatsoever, i.e. "dirrstizlike" ('daringly'; l. 16152), drove out all the people who had turned Jerusalem's temple into a marketplace. The populace was "forrdredd" ('terrified'; l. 16158) of him because of his "e3ze" ('anger'; l. 16161). Just as Christ did not pay any attention nor was intimidated by people's anger, we

are told that we should not “nimenn gom / Off naness manness eƷƷe” (‘pay attention to anyone’s anger’; ll. 16136-37) and should do what is right.

Unlike ME *eie*, but like ME *wratthe* and *erre*, the Norse-derived ME *bratthe* sometimes collocates with ME *nīth* or ME *nīth* and *hēte* (ll. 4719-20, 4727, 8012-13, 19947-48). What differentiates this term from the other two is that in all its occurrences but one (viz. ll. 4561, 4707, 4719, 4727, 8012) it points to the sin of wrath and appears with other sins, its most common companion being ME *grimmeleƷƷc* ‘cruelty’ and its variant ME *grimmcunndleƷƷc*.¹¹¹ The latter two terms are only recorded in the *Ormulum* and, therefore, it is difficult to know whether the association of these Norse-derived terms is just characteristic of Orm’s idiolect (to a great extent enhanced by the repetitive nature of his text) or represents wider usage.¹¹² Notably, the union of ME *bratthe* and *grim*, the native equivalent of Orm’s terms, does not appear to have been particularly common in Middle English texts. The near-exclusive use of ME *bratthe* (when associated with ANGER) to refer to the sin of wrath clearly differentiates it from the previously discussed terms of this lexico-semantic subfield, for they are recorded with this meaning (e.g. see ME *irre* in l. 3995 and ME *wratthe* in l. 19572), but the association is not as strong. This association is likely to be the result of Orm’s repetitiveness because his text is the only context where the *MED* and the *OED* record this meaning for the term.¹¹³ In the only context where the term does not refer to the sin, l. 19947, it appears in close proximity to ME *wratthe* (l. 19948) and we could speculate that its selection might have been dictated by the echoic effect arising from the use of both terms.

The association of Orm’s ME *gramcundnesse* with vices and sins is even stronger than for ME *bratthe*, as it is present in its only two attestations in the text (ll. 3833 and 9784). The length of the word might have contributed to its preference over its shorter near-synonyms, for it almost fills a hemistich by itself. It might also be the case that the two contexts where the term appears present a distant echo of the work of Orm’s Anglo-Saxon predecessors, his use of Ælfrician, Wulfstanian and

other Old English homiletic texts, directly or through memory, being well attested.¹¹⁴ Compare, for instance these passages:¹¹⁵

Forr Godess enngell iss full meoc,

7 soffte, 7 milde, 7 blipþe,

7 deofell iss all full off niþ,

7 full off grammcunndnesse,

7 full off hete towarrd mann,

7 full off modignesne (ll. 3830-35)

(‘For God’s angel is very gentle and soft and mild and merciful, and the Devil is completely full of enmity and full of rage and full of hatred towards mankind and full of pride’)

7 þurh þatt tatt teƷƷ wærenn ec

All fulle off grammcundnesse,

7 ec all fulle off attriƷ lund,

7 fulle off bitterr spæche,

7 fulle off hete, 7 fulle off niþ,

7 fulle off modignesne (ll. 9783-88)

(‘And because of that they were also completely full of rage and completely full of malicious nature and full of bitter speech and full of hatred and full of enmity and full of pride’)

Þonne se reða deoful: tihð þa cristenan men sume to forlire: sume he ontendt to gitsunge: Sume he arærð to modignysse: & sume he þurh graman totwæmð: & mid mislicum costnungum gastlice ofslyhð. (*Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies*, First Series, Homily 17)¹¹⁶

(‘Then the cruel Devil draws some Christian men to fornication; some he excites to covetousness; some he rears up to pride; and some he separates through anger and wounds them spiritually with various temptations.’)

And ealswa hy þær on blisse wæron þa hwile þe hy þær wæron, swa scylan cristene men eac mid bliðre heortan nu cyrican secan, forðam se ðe þider mid niðe oððon mid ænigum graman færð ne weorðað his lac þær Gode andfenge ne his gebeda fram Gode gehyrede ær he nið & graman mid ealle alæte. (Wulfstan’s homily on the dedication of a church)¹¹⁷

(‘And just as those there were in bliss while they were there, so should Christian men also seek churches now with a joyful heart, because whoever goes there with enmity or with any anger, his offerings are not acceptable to God, nor are his prayers heard by God until he lets go completely of the enmity and anger.’)

As we might expect, ME *wrōth* is Orm’s preferred adjective to explain that someone, including God, is full of anger (ll. 353, 1129, 4814, 8144, 19603, 19831, 19839). ME *gram* is another favourite of Orm, who always presents it in an alliterating collocation with ME *grille* (Orm’s <grill>) ‘fierce, cruel, full of hatred’, a collocation that does not seem to have been common in either Old or Middle English.¹¹⁸ Only in one context, l. 1545, is ME *gram* replaced by the longer ME *gramcund*, an adjective that Orm might have coined for metrical reasons. In all the contexts but one, ME *gram* and *grille* also appear with <bollzhenn>, the past participle of ME *belwen* ‘to become angry, enraged’. The past participle is only recorded on its own in ll. 19564, 19580 and 19670, the latter two lines being literal repetitions of l. 19564. In these lines it occupies the final position in the second hemistich, and, therefore, its disyllabic structure might have facilitated its presence. Holt notes that in l. 7169 there is an erasure of six lines, the first two being “Þatt he be gramm 7 grill 7 brapp / 7 azhefull 7 bollzhenn” (‘so that he may be angry and fierce and awe-inspiring and enraged’).¹¹⁹ We

find here, again, the past participle in the same position as in l. 19564 and the derivative lines. In the erasure we also find the Norse-derived adjective ME *brōth*. It is otherwise only recorded in the repetitive lines 7164 and 7173, which suggests that, like ME *bratthe*, it is a peripheral member of the lexico-semantic field. Other Middle English contexts indicate that the adjective was often associated with the more common ME *wrōth*, and it is this association and the similarity between the terms that might have facilitated the use of ME *bratthe* and *brōth* in English texts.¹²⁰

3.2.4 HATRED, ENMITY (*HTOED*, 02.02.23)

When it comes to the expression of HATRED or ENMITY, ME *nīth* seems to have been Orm's preferred term, for it commonly appears both on its own (e.g. ll. 76 and 83 in the Dedication, and 123, 417, 3832, 6267, etc.) and together with ME *hēte* (ll. 1404, 4454, 4462, 4720, 4727, 5578, etc.). The latter only occurs outside its common collocation with ME *nīth* (see above, 3.2.3) on two occasions: ll. 3834 (note the presence of ME *nīth* in l. 3832; see above) and 19572. In one of those contexts where the two terms appear together, l. 4720, they are joined by ME *apermōd*, a compound which, on the basis of lack of further attestation either in the *Ormulum* or elsewhere, appears to have been fairly peripheral in this lexico-semantic subfield (see further note 72). ME *lōth* seems to occupy a more important position than ME *apermōd* in Orm's idiolect. It is recorded in three contexts (ll. 5451, 6271 and 11887), possibly because of the echoic effects it contributes to create: in ll. 5451 and 11887 it appears in close proximity to the phrase "lape gast" ('hateful spirit'), a reference to the Devil, thus highlighting the loathsome nature of the latter and his enmity towards mankind; in l. 5451 the echoic effects are doubled because there, as in l. 6271, it collocates with *wratthe* ("wrappe 7 lappe," 'anger and hatred'), with rhyme emphasizing the negativity of these two feelings (see above, 3.2.3).¹²¹

3.2.5 PRIDE (*HTOED*, 02.02.28)

PRIDE is an emotion that Orm brings up time and again, it being one of the seven deadly sins. He mostly refers to this lexico-semantic field with members of the ME *mōd* word-field: ME *mōdīnesse* ‘pride’ (e.g. ll. 1289, 1397, 3835, 3990, 4565, 4979, 8322, 12301 and 12367), *mōdizleȝc* id. (ll. 73, 1544, 2633, 3994, 8011, 12266 and 12380), *mōdi* ‘proud’ (e.g. ll. 9613, 9814 and 11852) and *mōdīlī* ‘proudly’ (e.g. ll. 1296, 2035 and 2041). The alternation between the traditional ME *mōdīnesse* and ME *mōdizleȝc* is interesting as one of the various examples of metrically motivated variants. We saw earlier (cp. I.1.b in section 2) that Orm consistently replaced all the cases of the monosyllabic noun-forming suffix <-niss> with the Norse-derived *-leik* before l. 7524. There is only one original use of ME *mōdizleȝc* before the partition point: l. 3994. In this line it appears in coordination with the echoic ME *grēdīleik* ‘greediness, gluttony’, another original form unattested outside the *Ormulum*.¹²²

BOASTING (*HTOED*, 02.02. 28.16) is one way in which one can exhibit PRIDE, and, therefore, it is not surprising that Orm sometimes brings together members of the ME *mōd* and *yelp* ‘boasting; a boast’ word-fields (e.g. ll. 2041-42, 9834-35, 11777-78, 11795-96, 11967-68 and 12040-41). In preferring the latter to refer to BOASTING Orm follows the lexical traditions that he has inherited from his ancestors, OE *gielp* ‘boasting, pride’ and related terms having been very prominent members of this lexico-semantic subfield (cp. OE *gielp* ‘boasting, pride’, *gielpān* ‘to boast’, *gielpcwide* ‘boastful speech’, *gielpen* ‘boastful’, *gielpgeorn* ‘eager for glory, arrogant’, *gielpna* ‘boaster’, *gielpword* ‘boast’, etc.). ME *yelp* (always premodified by ME *īdel* ‘vain, futile’ in order to emphasize its worthlessness; cp. OE *īdelgielp* ‘empty boasting, vainglory’) and *yelpen* ‘to boast’ are often found on their own in the text (e.g. ME *īdel yelp*: ll. 390, 4913, 7366, 9709, 9991, 11777 and 11967; ME *yelpen*: ll. 2042, 4925 and 9834), while the members of the Norse-derived ME *rōs* ‘a boast, bragging’ word-field always appear in conjunction with a native word: ME *rōs* + *īdel yelp* in l. 4910, ME *rōsinge* ‘boasting’ + *īdel yelp* in ll. 4564 and 4902, and ME *rōsen* ‘to boast’ + *līen* ‘to lie’ in ll. 4906-07 (cp. ll. 16252 and 16255, where ME *līen* appears with ME *yelpen*). This combination might

have been intended not only to highlight the negativity of these actions but also to clarify further the meaning of the foreign word-field. The context where we find the clustering of the three Norse-derived terms also records two of the original *-leik* nouns in the text before l. 7524, both of which appear to have been fairly unusual: ME *duhhtizlezzc* ‘virtue’ (l. 4904) and *hazherlezc* ‘skill’ (l. 4906; cp. OIc *hagleikr* id.).¹²³ This is likely to be an indication of Orm’s search for expressiveness and a strong rhetorical effect in this passage, which discusses how to behave and presents types of behaviour to be avoided at all costs.¹²⁴ In this respect, this context is reminiscent of the lexical creativity that one can find in Archbishop Wulfstan’s lists of crimes and sins.¹²⁵

3.2.6 HUMILITY (*HTOED*, 02.02.29)

The members of the ME *mēk* word-field are, as a whole, Orm’s preferred terms to refer to the lexico-semantic subfield of HUMILITY, although not all of them are clearly favoured over their near-synonyms. ME *mēk* is a polysemous adjective in the text, whose meanings, according to the *MED*,¹²⁶ are associated with the subfields of HUMILITY (viz. ‘humble’), KINDNESS (‘gentle, mild, kind’; *HTOED*, 01.05.05.21.04.02), DOMESTIC ANIMAL (‘tame’; *HTOED*, 01.02.06.08) and OBEDIENCE (‘obedient, submissive’; cp. *HTOED*, 03.04.09.04, where the adjective is not actually recorded). This section focuses only on the contexts where the adjective means ‘humble’, although it is important to note that it is not always possible to establish a clear distinction between its various meanings, to some extent because its common companion ME *milde* shares its polysemy.¹²⁷ For instance, the *MED* suggests that the pair in ll. 667-68 should be seen as referring to KINDNESS, while the *OED* would associate this usage with HUMILITY instead.¹²⁸ The context of these lines, quoted below in 3.2.7, suggests that the *MED*’s interpretation might be more accurate.

ME *mēk* seems to mean ‘humble’ at least in nine contexts (ll. 2647, 4971, 6268, 6366, 8009, 9614, 10716, 13315 and 14913). In four of them (ll. 4971, 8009, 13315 and 14913) it is accompanied

by ME *milde*, a widespread alliterative collocation which might find its model in Old Norse (cp. OIc *mjúkr ok mildr*) or might have originated independently in England.¹²⁹ While ME *mēk* can also appear on its own with this meaning (ll. 6268 and 9614, where it is given as antonym of ME *mōdi*, on which see above, 3.2.5, and l. 10716), ME *milde* on its own normally refers to KINDNESS, not HUMILITY. In this respect, ME *ēdmōd* might be a closer alternative for the expression of HUMILITY, as it is used both with (ll. 6366 and 8009-10) and without ME *mēk* (ll. 2887, 5645 and 9065).

The ME *mēk* and *ēdmōd* word-fields also overlap when an adverb meaning ‘humbly’ is required: ME *mēklī* and *ēdmōdlīche* are used once each with this meaning (ll. 11392 and 9843, respectively), the choice between them being determined, at least to some extent, by metrical reasons, as the native term has at least one more syllable than its Norse-derived counterpart. Yet, Orm’s preference for the ME *mēk* word-field becomes clear as far as the nouns meaning ‘humility’ are concerned. While ME *mēklāc* and *mēknesse* are recorded on seven (e.g. ll. 1170, 1546, 2535, 2605 and 6276) and over forty occasions (e.g. ll. 10699, 10708, 10907 and 10908), respectively, ME *ēdmōdnesse* meaning ‘humility’ is recorded four times (ll. 1547, 1582, 15693 and 19218), and ME *edmōdlege* (<æddmodleʒʒc>) once (viz. l. 1929), as a metrical variant at the end of the first hemistich. Similarly, ME *mētlezk* (cp. ME *mēte* ‘proper, appropriate’) can only be found in l. 2659.¹³⁰

The overlap between the ME *mēk* and *ēdmōd* word-fields does not extend to the verbs. Although ME *ēdmōdien* ‘to humble someone or oneself’ is attested in other early Middle English texts, Orm does not include it in his work. Instead, he relies on two Norse-derived verbs (viz. ME *mēken* and *louen*) and the native ME *netheren* when he needs a verb with that meaning. ME *mēken*, which is attested six times (ll. 9385, 11864, 13688, 13950, 15907, 19353), seems to refer to HUMILITY in relation to OBEDIENCE, these being two of the lexico-semantic subfields that ME *mēk* is associated with, while ME *louen* and *netheren* bring in a nuance of lowering one’s status, on the basis of their association with ME *lou* ‘low’ and OE *niðera* / ME *nethere* ‘lower’, respectively.¹³¹ Interestingly, when the latter two verbs have the meaning under consideration here, they often co-occur with

members of the ME *mēk* word-field, which might exemplify further Orm's attempt to seek lexical variation and heightened expression in particularly significant contexts (e.g. ME *louen* in ll. 2639, 2644, 3749, and 11864, where it is coordinated with ME *mēken*; and ME *netheren* in l. 9609). Because of the association of these two verbs with the lowering of one's status and standing, they are also used, often together, to refer to particular types of humbling behaviour, either towards oneself or towards others: taking on human nature in order to redeem humanity, in the case of Christ's Incarnation (e.g. ll. 3730-31, 13965-66, 19214, where this is explicitly said to be an act of *mēknesse*, and 19220), being subservient towards those below oneself in line with God's example (ll. 10716, 10738, 10760 and, possibly, 13970-71), and humiliating others (ll. 18256-57; *HTOED*, 02.02.29.02, vt.).

3.2.7 FEAR (*HTOED*, 02.02.30)

Orm tends to rely on the members of the ME *drēde* 'fear' word-field when expressing FEAR. Thus, when he refers to someone being afraid or dreading something or someone, he most frequently chooses ME *drēdren*; the cause of fear can be as varied as a powerful man (e.g. l. 7167), St John the Baptist (e.g. l. 19965), an angel (e.g. l. 151), or God (e.g. ll. 852, 1218, 6179, 16206, etc.). Surprisingly, though, ME *eie* (the native cognate of ME *aue*) and not ME *drēde* is Orm's favourite noun to express FEAR in general (*HTOED*, 02.02.30, n.; see ll. 4481, 6313 and 19957). ME *drēding* is in the main reserved for the expression of a particular type of fear, viz. RELIGIOUS AWE or reverential fear of God (*HTOED*, 02.02.30.04, n., 03; ll. 5602, 5610, 5612, 5619, 5622). Only on one occasion (viz. l. 7185), does the noun mean AWE more generally, without the specific association with God (*HTOED*, 02.02.30.04, n., and 02.01.17.02.01, n., 07).¹³² In this context ME *drēding* co-occurs with the Norse-derived ME *aue*, the only attestation of this noun in the text. The fact that the term in Orm's idiolect might refer generally to the REVERENTIAL FEAR and admiration of someone rather

than specifically to RELIGIOUS AWE is further suggested by the presence of the adjective ME *aueful* in l. 7172, which is attributed to a king who commands great fear (*HTOED*, 02.02.30.10.02, adj.), probably because of his angry nature (cp. the use of ME *eie* in that context; see above, 3.2.3).

ME *drēding* and *aue* in l. 7185 are part of a collocation with ME *setten ~ on*, which the *MED* interprets as ‘to make (sb.) afraid, frighten, intimidate, overawe’.¹³³ Yet, when Orm refers to the concept of MAKING SOMEONE AFRAID OR FRIGHTENED (*HTOED*, 02.02.30.10, vt.), he tends to do so in the passive voice, i.e. with a past participle meaning ‘frightened or afraid’, that is, he tends to refer to people’s state of mind rather than actions. As might be expected, ME *fordrēd*, the past participle of the derivative ME *fordrēden* ‘to be badly frightened, to fear greatly’, is his preferred term to describe someone who is fearful and afraid (*HTOED*, 02.02.30, adj.; e.g. ll. 147, 659, 2183, 3343, 3348, 3827, 3836, etc.). On six occasions, in order to facilitate elision after a word ending in a vowel, ME *fordrēd* is replaced with the synonymous *ofdrēd*, the past participle of *ofdrēden* ‘to fear, be afraid, be frightened by’ (ll. 3343, 3809, 3813, 7162, 7925 and 7963). Only on one occasion is the Norse-derived adjective ME *rade* (Orm’s <radd>) chosen to express the same meaning as these past participles (l. 2170), possibly because of its monosyllabic character (cp. l. 2183 and 2205, where ME *fordrēd* is used instead, even when we would have expected a monosyllabic word at the end of the first hemistich in l. 2205). The position in this lexico-semantic subfield of ME *fēren* ‘to frighten’, the only verb that is not solely recorded as a past participle, is more important. The two contexts where the verb is recorded, which are very similar, are also the only contexts where ME *skerren* and *forglōpned* appear in the text:

He warrþ forrfæredd 7 forrdredd,

Swa summ þe Goddspell kiþeþþ.

7 Godess enngell toc himm þær

To beldenn 7 to frofrenn

Forr ure wrecche kinde iss swille
 Þatt itt mazg ben forrfæredd,
 ʒiff þatt itt ohht færlike seþ
 Þe wlite off ennglekinde.
 7 Godess enngell iss full meoc,
 7 milde, 7 soffte, 7 blipþe,
 To beldenn 7 to frofrenn þe,
 ʒiff he þe seþ forrgloppnedd.
 Acc deofell iss, þatt witt tu wel,
 Off grimme 7 nipfull herrte;
 Forr ʒiff he seþ þatt mann iss ohht
 Forrfæredd off hiss sihhþe,
 He wile himm færenn, ʒiff he mazg,
 7 skerrenn mare 7 mare.
 Acc whas itt iss þatt waepnedd iss
 Wiþþ fulle trowwþe o Criste,
 Þohh þatt he se þe laþe gast,
 Niss he rihht nohht forrfæredd. (ll. 659-80; cp. ll. 3828-43)

(‘He became frightened and terrified, as the Gospel explains, and God’s angel took him there to encourage and comfort him, because our wretched nature is such that it may be frightened if it somewhat unexpectedly sees the resplendent beauty of angels. And God’s angel is very gentle and kind and soft and merciful to encourage and comfort you, if he sees you frightened. But the Devil—you know it well—is of a fierce and malicious nature, for, if he sees that someone is somewhat frightened of his appearance, he intends to terrify him if he can and scare

him more and more. But whoever is armed with full faith in Christ, even though he may see the hateful spirit, he is not frightened at all.’)

In these contexts, *(for)fēred* and *forglopned* are used as alternatives to ME *fōdrēd*. The preference for past participles with the prefix *for-*, which emphasizes the overpowering character of someone’s fear when faced with an angel or the Devil,¹³⁴ contributes to highlighting the terror surrounding human beings in that situation,¹³⁵ and that might be also one of the reasons for the accumulation of a number of near-synonyms in these contexts. While ME *fēren* and *forglopned* do not seem to have any particular negative connotations, ME *skerren* is associated with the actions of the Devil. However, because of its limited use, it is difficult to know whether the Norse-derived verb had stronger negative connotations than its near-synonyms ME *fēren* and *glopnen* in Orm’s idiolect.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The close analysis of the way in which various Norse-derived terms function in the lexico-semantic field of EMOTION has allowed us to establish that, unlike other Norse loans with longer use in written texts (see above, 3.1), the words studied here (with the exception of the ME *mēk* word-field; see above, 3.2.6) tend to have very peripheral positions in their respective lexico-semantic subfields, to the extent that they might only be recorded once. This makes establishing the actual meaning of some of these terms (e.g. ME *forglopned*, *gōlike* and *apermōd*; see 3.2.1 and notes 71 and 72) particularly difficult. Despite this difficulty, it is clear that the Norse-derived terms are in the main associated with emotions with negative connotations (ANGER, FEAR, MENTAL PAIN or SUFFERING, PRIDE, and HATRED or ENMITY), although the reasons for this association are not equally clear. In some cases, the Norse-derived terms seem to have particularly strong negative associations (e.g. the reference of ME *bratthe* almost exclusively to the sin of wrath, or the connection between ME

skerren and the actions of the Devil; see 3.2.3 and 3.2.7), but, again, the limited number of uses of these terms and the repetitive character of the text make definite conclusions hard to establish.

In the course of this study we have also had a chance to review some of the issues that seem to have influenced Orm's lexical choices, such as the semantic shades of a term (e.g. the use of ME *eie* in contexts where two of its meanings, viz. ANGER and FEAR, are important; see 3.2.3); tradition (e.g. the common use of well-established English and Norse collocations, such as ME *sorwe and sīte*; see 3.2.2); the wording of his sources and the metaphors they include (e.g. the selection of ME *baiten* in a context referring to vipers and the use of ME *erre* to render *L ira*; see 3.2.2 and 3.2.3; see also 3.2.1); metrical reasons (e.g. the monosyllabic character of ME *radde* in Orm's text might have made it preferable to its near-synonyms in the only context where it occurs; see 3.2.7, and also 1.1.b in section 2 and 3.2.5); and other stylistic reasons, such as alliteration and rhyme, which facilitate the use of both traditional and non-traditional collocations (e.g. ME *mēk and mīlde*, *sorwe and sīte*, and "wrappe 7 lappe"; see 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.6 and 3.2.7).

Thus, this study has shown that it is only through the careful consideration of the way in which a particular lexico-semantic field works that one can establish its make-up, the relationships that its various members have with one another and the techniques employed by a particular author in his lexical choices. It is hoped that more scholars will see past the repetitive, boring, diffuse... style of texts like the *Ormulum* and will conduct close studies on their lexis in order to gain a better understanding of Middle English vocabulary in general and the paths and processes of integration of the Norse-derived terms in particular.

¹ R. W. D. Burchfield, "The Language and Orthography of the *Ormulum* MS," *Transactions of the Philological Society*, (1956), 58; and Guzmán Mancho, "Considering *Ormmulum*'s Exegetical Discourse: Canon Orrmin's Preaching and his Audience," *English Studies*, 85 (2004), 508-19.

² C. M. Millward, *Biography of the English Language* (Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College, 1996), p. 204.

³ David Burnley, *The History of the English Language: A Source Book*, 2nd ed. (Harlow: Longman, 2000), p. 82.

⁴ For instance, J. A. W. Bennett and G. V. Smithers, *Early Middle English Verse and Prose*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), p. 174; Derek Pearsall, *Old English and Middle English Poetry*, The Routledge History of English Poetry, 1 (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977), p. 12; and J. A. W. Bennett, *Middle English Literature 1100-1400* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), p. 32.

⁵ N. R. Ker, "Unpublished Parts of the *Ormulum* Printed from MS. Lambeth 783," *Medium Ævum*, 9 (1940), 1-22; and Kees Dekker, *The Origins of Old Germanic Studies in the Low Countries*, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 92 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), ch. 3.

⁶ Much has been written on the spelling system which Orm devised for the text and what it can tell us about various early Middle English phonological issues, such as Middle English Open Syllable Lengthening and the monophthongization of the Old English diphthong /eo(:)/. See, for instance, Burchfield, "Language and Orthography of the *Ormulum* MS"; Betty S. Phillips, "Open Syllable Lengthening and the *Ormulum*," *Word*, 43 (1992), 375-82; Robert W. Murray, "Orm's Phonological-Orthographic Interface and Quantity in Early Middle English," in *Quantitätsproblematik und Metrik: Greifswalder Symposion zur germanischen Grammatik*, ed. A. Quak and P. Vermeijden, especial issue of *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik*, 42 (1995), 125-47; Robert D. Fulk, "Consonant Doubling and Open Syllable Lengthening in the *Ormulum*," *Anglia*, 114 (1996), 481-513; John Anderson and Derek Britton, "Double Trouble: Geminata versus Simplex Graphs in the *Ormulum*," *Studies in Middle English Linguistics*, ed. J. Fisiak, Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, 103 (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997), pp. 23-58; Christopher Cannon, "Spelling Practice: The *Ormulum* and the Word," *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 33 (1997), 229-44;

John Anderson and Derek Britton, "The Orthography and Phonology of the *Ormulum*," *English Language and Linguistics*, 3 (1998), 299-334; and Tomasz Mokrowiecki, "Reduplication of Consonant Graphemes in the *Ormulum* in the Light of Late Old English Scribal Evidence," *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 47 (2012), 53-79. Because of Orm's idiosyncratic spelling, his name is sometimes also spelt <Orrm(in)> and his text <Orrmulum>, these being the actual spellings that we find in the text (see ll. 1-2 in the Preface). All the line numbers and quotations have been taken from the following edition: Robert Holt (ed.), *The Ormulum, with Notes and Glossary of Dr R. M. White*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1878).

⁷ M. B. Parkes, "On the Presumed Date and Possible Origin of the *Orrmulum*: Oxford Bodleian Library, MS Junius 1," in *Five Hundred Years of Words and Sounds: A Festschrift for Eric Dobson*, ed. E. G. Stanley and Douglas Gray (Cambridge: Brewer, 1983), pp. 115-27.

⁸ Pauline Stafford, *The East Midlands in the Early Middle Ages*, Studies in the Early History of Britain (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1985); and Cyril R. Hart, *The Danelaw* (London: Hambledon Press, 1992).

⁹ On Old Norse influence on the text's syntax, see, for instance, David Denison, "Aspects of the History of English Group-Verbs, with Particular Attention to the Syntax of the *Ormulum*," unpublished doctoral dissertation (University of Oxford, 1981); Carola Trips, *From OV to VO in Early Middle English*, *Linguistik Aktuell: Linguistics Today*, 60 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002); and Carola Trips, "Stylistic Fronting in the *Ormulum*: Scandinavian Syntactic Phenomena in Early Middle English Texts," *Nordlyd: Tromsø University Working Papers on Language and Linguistics*, 31 (2003), 457-72. On Scandinavian influence on the text's phrases, see E. S. Olszewska, "Some English and Norse Alliterative Phrases," *Saga-Book* 12 (1937-45 [1945]), 238-45; E. S. Olszewska, "Middle English *trigg 7 trowwe*," *English and Germanic Studies*, 1 (1947-48), 88-90; E. S. Olszewska, "Alliterative Phrases in the *Ormulum*: Some Norse Parallels," in *English*

and *Medieval Studies: Presented to J. R. R. Tolkien on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Norman Davis and C. L. Wrenn (London: Allen, 1962), pp. 112-27; and E. S. Olszewska, “ME. ‘takenn 7 trowwenn’,” *Notes and Queries*, 218 (1973), 83.

¹⁰ Erik Brate, “Nordische Lehnwörter im Ormulum,” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 10 (1885), 1-80 and 580-86. Janne Skaffari, *Studies in Early Middle English Loanwords: Norse and French Influences*, Anglicana Turkuensia, 26 (Turku: University of Turku, 2009), pp. 177-79, points out that this is the most heavily Scandinavianized text amongst the early Middle English texts that make up his corpus.

¹¹ Arnold Hille, “On the Distribution of the Forms *to* and *till* in the *Ormulum*,” *English Studies*, 85 (2004), 22-32.

¹² Nils-Lennart Johannesson, “Old English versus Old Norse Vocabulary in the *Ormulum*: The Choice of Third Person Plural Personal Pronouns,” in *Studies in Anglistics*, ed. Gunnel Melchers and Beatrice Warren (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International, 1995), pp. 171-80.

¹³ Nils-Lennart Johannesson, “Bread, Crumbs and Related Matters in the *Ormulum*,” *Selected Proceedings of the 2005 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX)*, ed. R. W. McConchie et al. (Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 2006), pp. 69-82.

¹⁴ *HTOED*, ed. Christian Kay et al., 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); Holt, *Ormulum*.

¹⁵ Burchfield, “Language and Orthography of the *Ormulum* MS.” Nils-Lennart Johannesson is currently working on a new edition of the text as part of the *Ormulum Project*

(www2.english.su.se/nlj/ormproj/ormulum.htm) and
(www2.english.su.se/nlj/orrmproj/orrmulum_site.html).

¹⁶ Sara M. Pons-Sanz, *The Lexical Effects of Anglo-Scandinavian Linguistic Contact on Old English*, *Studies in the Early Middle Ages*, 1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), ch. 2; Philip Durkin, *Borrowed Words: A History of Loanwords in English* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), ch. 10; and

Sara M. Pons-Sanz, “Identifying and Dating Norse-Derived Terms in Medieval English: Approaches and Problems,” in *Early Germanic Languages in Contact: A Symposium*, Ed. John Ole Askedal and Hans Frede Nielsen, NOWELE Supplement Series (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, forthcoming).

¹⁷ Richard M. Hogg, *A Grammar of Old English*, vol. 1: *Phonology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), §5.7.

¹⁸ The forms of the Middle English terms provided here, except for ME *apermōd*, are those given as headwords in the *Middle English Dictionary* (hereafter *MED*), ed. Hans Kurath et al. (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1952-2001); Orm’s forms are given in brackets.

¹⁹ Brate, “Nordische Lehnwörter im Ormulum,” pp. 33-34.

²⁰ Albert Erikson Egge, “Scandinavian Influence on English: Together with Lists of Scandinavian Loan-Words in the *Ormulum* and *A Bestiary*,” unpublished doctoral dissertation (Johns Hopkins University, 1887), p. 55; and Erik Björkman, *Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English*, 2 vols, *Studien zur englischen Philologie*, 7 and 11 (Halle: Niemeyer, 1900-02), p. 41. Cp. the *MED*, s.v. *baiten*; and the *Oxford English Dictionary*, ed. John A. Simpson and Edmund Weiner, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), hereafter *OED* 1989, s.v. *bait*, v.¹.

²¹ Hogg, *Grammar of Old English*, §5.79; and Vladimir Orel, *A Handbook of Germanic Etymology* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), s.v. *baitjanan*.

²² See also the *OED* 1989, s.v. *-laik*.

²³ “The Language and Orthography of the Ormulum MS,” pp. 72-73.

²⁴ For the lexico-semantic subfield of *mīldhertelegc*, see the *HTOED*, 02.02.25. On ME *-leik* in early Middle English texts, see further Skaffari, *Studies in Early Middle English Loanwords*, pp. 167-68.

²⁵ Anderson and Britton, “Double Trouble,” p. 54, n. 9; and the *OED* 1989, s.v. *woe*, int. and adv., n. and adj.

²⁶ Björkman, *Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English*, pp. 50-52; and the *MED*, s.v. *wei*, n.4.

²⁷ Hogg, *Grammar of Old English*, §§3.22-25.

-
- ²⁸ Richard Jordan, *Handbook of Middle English Grammar: Phonology*, trans. and rev. by Eugene Joseph Crook, *Janua Linguarum: Studia Memoriae Nicolai van Wijk Dedicata, Series Practica*, 218 (The Hague: Mouton, 1974), p. 44; the *MED*, s.v. *brōth*; the *OED* 1989, s.v. *brath*, *braith*; and Susanne Kries, *Skandinavisch-schottische Sprachbeziehungen im Mittelalter: der altnordische Lehneinfluss*, *North-Western European Language Evolution Supplement*, 20 (Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark, 2003), pp. 93 and 421.
- ²⁹ Brate, “Nordische Lehnwörter im Ormulum,” p. 35; Björkman, *Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English*, pp. 88-89; Julius Pokorny (ed.), *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols. (Bern: Francke, 1959-69), I, 132-33; and Jan de Vries (ed.), *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Leiden: Brill, 1961), s.v. *bráðr*.
- ³⁰ Frank Heidermanns, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der germanischen Primäradjektive*, *Studia linguistica germanica*, 33 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1993), pp. 368-69; and Gus Kroonen, *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*, *Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series*, 11 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), s.v. **lēgu-*. See also Brate, “Nordische Lehnwörter im Ormulum,” p. 47; Björkman, *Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English*, p. 90; the *MED*, s.v. *loue*, adj.; de Vries, *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, s.v. *lágr*; and the *Oxford English Dictionary*, ed. by John A. Simpson, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000-), available at <www.oed.com>, hereafter *OED* 2000-, s.v. *low*, adj. and n.².
- ³¹ Brate, “Nordische Lehnwörter im Ormulum,” p. 53; Björkman, *Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English*, p. 218; Jordan, *Handbook of Middle English Grammar*, §23; Hogg, *Grammar of Old English*, §5.199; the *OED* 2000-, s.v. *rad*, adj.²; and Kries, *Skandinavisch-schottische Sprachbeziehungen im Mittelalter*, p. 91.

³² Brate, “Nordische Lehnwörter im Ormulum,” p. 64; Björkman, *Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English*, pp. 91-92; the *MED*, s.v. *wandreth*; de Vries, *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, s.v. *vandráðr*; and the *OED* 1989, s.v. *wandreth*.

³³ Holt, *Ormulum*; cp. the *MED*, s.v. *awwermōd*.

³⁴ R. W. B. Burchfield, “Two Misreadings of the *Ormulum* Manuscript,” *Medium Ævum*, 21 (1952), 38; and Burchfield, “Language and Orthography of the *Ormulum* MS,” p. 62. See the bottom of col. 116 in the manuscript.

³⁵ Adolf Noreen, *Geschichte der nordischen Sprachen: besonders in altnordischer Zeit*, 3rd ed. *Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie*, 4 (Strasburg: Karl J. Trübner, 1913), §69; and Kroonen, *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*, s.v. *ampra-*.

³⁶ Brate, “Nordische Lehnwörter im Ormulum,” p. 56; Björkman, *Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English*, pp. 175-76; the *OED* 1989, s.v. *site*, n.¹; and Kries, *Skandinavisch-schottische Sprachbeziehungen im Mittelalter*, pp. 393-94. I use *word-field* as equivalent of *word-family*, i.e. it refers to the group of words that share the same root, including compounds which have that root as one of their components.

³⁷ Noreen, *Geschichte der nordischen Sprachen*, §74. On the possible existence of OE **syht* / *siht*, see Sara M. Pons-Sanz, “An Etymological Note on Two Old English Medical Terms: *ridesoht* and *flacg*,” *Studia Neophilologica*, 79 (2007), 45-53.

³⁸ Hogg, *Grammar of Old English*, §7.17 (4). In Old English <sc> represents both [ʃ] and [sk], whereas Orm’s spellings differentiate between the two sounds: <(s)sh> and <(s)sk>, respectively.

³⁹ De Vries, *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, s.v. *skirra*; and the *OED* 1989, s.v. *scare*, v.

⁴⁰ Brate, “Nordische Lehnwörter im Ormulum,” p. 57; Björkman, *Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English*, pp. 124-25; and the *MED*, s.v. *skerren*.

⁴¹ Noreen, *Geschichte der nordischen Sprachen*, §61; and Hogg, *Grammar of Old English*, §§4.17-18.

⁴² Björkman, *Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English*, p. 165; and Kroonen, *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*, s.v. *rēdan-*.

⁴³ Hogg, *Grammar of Old English*, §§5.80 and 7.16. Note that <ʒh> indicates that this is a velar sound ([ɣ]), as opposed to <ʒ>, which represents /j/ in the *Ormulum*.

⁴⁴ Brate, “Nordische Lehnwörter im Ormulum,” p. 32; Björkman, *Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English*, p. 199; the *MED*, s.v. *aue*, n.; de Vries, *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, s.v. *agi*; the *OED* 1989, s.v. *awe*, n.¹; and Kroonen, *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*, s.v. *agan-*.

⁴⁵ The *MED*, s.v. *aueful*.

⁴⁶ Brate, “Nordische Lehnwörter im Ormulum,” p. 32; Björkman, *Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English*, p. 200; the *MED*, s.v. *angren*; de Vries, *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, s.v. *angra*; the *OED* 1989, s.v. *anger*, v.; and Kroonen, *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*, s.v. *angaza-*. Elfdalian is a Swedish dialect.

⁴⁷ Kroonen, *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*, s.v. **meuka-*, *mūka*; and Heidermanns, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der germanischen Primäradjektive*, p. 411. See also Brate, “Nordische Lehnwörter im Ormulum,” p. 51; Björkman, *Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English*, p. 217; the *MED*, s.v. *mēk*; de Vries, *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, s.v. *mjúkr*; the *OED* 2000-, s.v. *meek*, adj. and n.; and Scaffari, *Studies in Early Middle English Loanwords*, pp. 161 and 166-67. On the alternation between <eo> and <e> in the root of this word-field, see Burchfield, “The Language and Orthography of the Ormulum MS,” pp. 80-84; and Richard Dance, *Words Derived from Old Norse in Early Middle English: Studies in the Vocabulary of the South-West Midland Texts*,

Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 246 (Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2003), p. 129.

⁴⁸ The *OED* 1989, s.v. *gloppen*; and Orel, *Handbook of Germanic Etymology*, s.vv. *zlupnōjanan* and *zlūpanan*.

⁴⁹ Brate, “Nordische Lehnwörter im Ormulum,” p. 41; Per Thorson, *Anglo-Norse Studies: An Inquiry into the Scandinavian Elements in the Modern English Dialects* (Amsterdam: N. V. Swets, 1936), pp. 62-63; the *MED*, s.v. *gloppen*; de Vries, *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, s.v. *glúpna*; and the *OED* 1989, s.vv. *for-*, prefix¹, and *gloppen*.

⁵⁰ D. Gary Miller, “The Morphosyntactic Legacy of Scand-English Contact,” in *For the Loue of Inglis Lede*, ed. Marcin Krygier and Liliana Sikorska, *Medieval English Mirror*, 1 (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2004), pp. 11-12.

⁵¹ *Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English*, p. 241.

⁵² “Nordische Lehnwörter im Ormulum,” p. 41.

⁵³ Brate, “Nordische Lehnwörter im Ormulum,” p. 44; the *MED*, s.v. *gōlike*; and the *OED* 1989, s.v. *golik*. On the presence of the interrogation mark, see below, [3.2.1](#).

⁵⁴ The *MED*, s.v. *stōrlī*, adj.; and Dance, *Words Derived from Old Norse in Early Middle English*, p. 377.

⁵⁵ The *OED* 1989, s.v. *-ly*, suffix¹; Hogg, *Grammar of Old English*, §§7.15-39; and Dance, *Words Derived from Old Norse in Early Middle English*, p. 295, n. 21.

⁵⁶ Björkman, *Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English*, p. 218; Thorson, *Anglo-Norse Studies*, p. 74; the *MED*, s.vv. *rōs*, *rōsen* and *rōsing*; Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, I, 531; de Vries, *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, s.vv. *hróðr* and *hrósa*; the *OED* 2000-, s.vv. *roose*, n., *roose*, v., and *roosing*; and Kries, *Skandinavisch-schottische Sprachbeziehungen im Mittelalter*, p. 94.

⁵⁷ “Bread, Crumbs and Related Matters in the *Ormulum*,” p. 69. Cp. Hille, “On the Distribution of the Forms *to* and *till* in the *Ormulum*,” who explains the distribution of ME *tō* and *till* on the basis of phonological conditions (see below) and the fact that the two prepositions are not fully equivalent in Orm’s idiolect.

⁵⁸ Cp. Stephen Morrison, “Orm’s English Sources,” *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, 221 (1984), 54-64; and Stephen Morrison, “A Reminiscence of Wulfstan in the Twelfth Century,” *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 96 (1995), 229-341.

⁵⁹ Alarik Rynell, *The Rivalry of Scandinavian and Native Synonyms in Middle English Especially taken and nimen*, Lund Studies in English, 13 (Lund: Gleerup, 1948), pp. 59-69. Cp. Jerzy Węna, “*Nim* or *take*? A Competition between Two High Frequency Verbs in Middle English,” *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 41 (2005), 62-63.

⁶⁰ *Rivalry of Scandinavian and Native Synonyms in Middle English*, pp. 61-62.

⁶¹ The *MED*, s.v. *yēme*, sense a.

⁶² *Rivalry of Scandinavian and Native Synonyms in Middle English*, p. 63.

⁶³ Cp. Sara M. Pons-Sanz, *Norse-Derived Vocabulary in Late Old English Texts: Wulfstan’s Works, a Case Study*, North-Western European Language Evolution Supplement, 22 (Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark, 2007), pp. 90-96; and Richard Dance, “*Ealde æ, niwæ laze*: Two Words for ‘Law’ in the Twelfth Century (with an Appendix by Richard Dance and Aidan Conti),” *New Medieval Literatures*, 13 (2011), 149-82.

⁶⁴ Olszewska, “ME. ‘takenn 7 trowwenn’”; see also above, note 9.

⁶⁵ On the metrical structure of the *Ormulum*, see Elizabeth Solopova, “The Metre of the *Ormulum*,” in *Studies in English Language and Literature: ‘Doubt Wisely’, Papers in Honour of E. G. Stanley*, ed. Mary Jane Toswell and Elizabeth M. Tyler (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 423-39.

⁶⁶ “*Ealde æ, niwæ laze*,” p. 168.

⁶⁷ “Old English versus Old Norse Vocabulary in the *Ormulum*,” p. 173.

⁶⁸ Johannesson, “Old English versus Old Norse Vocabulary in the *Ormulum*,” p. 176.

⁶⁹ Rynell, *Rivalry of Scandinavian and Native Synonyms in Middle English*, p. 63.

⁷⁰ On this pair, see also Christine Fell, “*Unfrið*: An Approach to a Definition,” *Saga-Book of the Viking Society*, 21 (1982-85), 85-100; and Pons-Sanz, *Lexical Effects of Anglo-Scandinavian Linguistic Contact on Old English*, pp. 178-80. On alliterative and rhyming phrases in the *Ormulum*, see further E. S. Olszewska, “The Alliterative Phrases in the *Ormulum*,” *Leeds Studies in English*, 5 (1936), 50-67.

⁷¹ The *OED* 1989, s.v. *for-*, prefix¹, interprets ME *forglopped* as meaning ‘overwhelmed with astonishment’ and, accordingly, the *HTOED* (02.01.14.02, adj.) associates it with SURPRISE rather than FEAR. However, the context where it occurs in the *Ormulum* (see below, 3.2.7) suggests that, while the term is indeed likely to carry an element of SURPRISE (AMAZEMENT or ASTONISHMENT), it should also be associated with words expressing FEAR in the text. Cp. Holt, *Ormulum*, II, 457, s.v. *forrgloppnedd*, who tells us that the participle means ‘disturbed with fear, astonishment’; the *MED*, s.vv. *forglopped*, where the participle is given the meaning ‘badly frightened’, and *gloppen*; and the *OED* 1989, s.v. *gloppen*.

⁷² ME *apermōd* is not recorded in the *OED*; it has been associated here with the same semantic category as PDE *bitterness* when it refers to HATRED or ENMITY (*OED*, s.v. *bitterness*, sense d) on the basis that it appears next to its near-synonyms ME *hēte* ‘hatred’ and *nīth* ‘hatred, malice, envy’ in its only occurrence (l. 4720; see below, 3.2.4) and that the *MED*, s.v. *awermod*, gives ‘a disposition to do harm, ill-will’ as the meaning of the term. It may, however, also be the case that the noun should be attributed another of the meanings of *bitterness*, viz. ‘acrimony of temper, actions or words’ (*OED* 1989, s.v. *bitterness*, sense d), which would associate it with the terms discussed below under 3.2.3. After all, as noted in that section, Orm commonly joins terms referring to ANGER and HATRED

or ENMITY (ME *bratthe* is, in fact, recorded in l. 4719, and in l. 4727 we find the union of ME *hēte*, *nīth* and *bratthe*, which might be replacing ME *apermōd*).

⁷³ Jerzy Welna, “*Good : Ill and Healthy : Ill*: The Fates of a Scandinavian Loanword in Medieval English,” in *Language in Contact 2010*, ed. P. P. Chruszczewski and Z. Wąsik, Philologica Wratislaviensia: Acta et Studia, 4 (Wrocław: Philological School of Higher Education in Wrocław Publishing, 2010), p. 188.

⁷⁴ Welna, “*Good : Ill and Healthy : Ill*,” p. 188.

⁷⁵ Welna, “*Good : Ill and Healthy : Ill*,” p. 189.

⁷⁶ Unless otherwise stated, all the translations from the *Ormulum* and the Old English and Latin texts are my own. I am very thankful to Lizzy Allman for her help with the Latin translations.

⁷⁷ Nils-Lennart Johannesson, “On Orm’s Relationship to his Latin Sources,” in *Studies in Middle English Forms and Meanings*, ed. Gabriella Mazzon (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2007), p. 136. References to and quotations from the Latin Bible rely on the version of the Vulgate included in <http://www.biblegateway.com/> (accessed from 15/05/2014 to 30/01/2015).

⁷⁸ Gregor Sarrazin, “Über die Quellen des Ormulum,” *Englische Studien*, 6 (1882), 1-27; Heinrich C. Matthes, *Die Einheitlichkeit des Ormulum: Studien zur Textkritik, zu den Quellen und zur sprachlichen Form von Orrmins Evangelienbuch*, Germanische Bibliothek, 36 (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1933).

⁷⁹ Stephen Morrison, “Sources for the *Ormulum*: A Re-Examination,” *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 84 (1983), 419-36; Stephen Morrison, “New Sources for the *Ormulum*,” *Neophilologus*, 68 (1984), 444-50; Morrison, “Orm’s English Sources”; Morrison, “Reminiscence of Wulfstan in the Twelfth Century”; and Johannesson, “On Orm’s Relationship to his Latin Sources.”

⁸⁰ “On Orm’s Relationship to his Latin Sources.” For an edition of Eurigena’s text, see Édouard Jeuneau (ed.), *Commentaire sur l’évangile de Jean* (Paris: Cerf, 1972).

⁸¹ “On Orm’s Relationship to his Latin Sources,” p. 141. The percentages add up to more than 100% because of the overlap between various sources.

⁸² *PL* = J. P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologia Latina* (Paris, 1815-75). Electronic edition is available at <<http://pld.chadwyck.co.uk>>.

⁸³ Sarracin, “Über die Quellen des Ormulum,” p. 18, for a similar claim.

⁸⁴ Holt, *Ormulum*.

⁸⁵ The *MED*, s.v. *gōlike*; and the *OED* 1989, s.v. *golik*.

⁸⁶ Johannesson, “On Orm’s Relationship to his Latin Sources.”

⁸⁷ Bede seems to associate the prosperity of the city with the works conducted there in his commentary on Matthew’s Gospel: he provides “ager pinguedinis” (‘field of fatness’) as one of the interpretations for the name of the town and explains that it is based on “opulentia bonorum operum, et abundantia charitatis” (‘the wealth of good deeds and the abundance of love’; *PL* vol. 92, col. 21).

⁸⁸ Selah Merrill, “Capernaum, Christ’s ‘Own City’,” *The Biblical World*, 11 (1898), 154-55; and W. J. P. Boyd, “Aldrediana VII: Hebraica,” *English Philological Studies*, 10 (1967), 5.

⁸⁹ Paul Anton de Lagarde (ed.), *Onomastica Sacra*, 2nd ed. (Göttingen: Dieterich L. Horstmann, 1887), p. 203, 4.

⁹⁰ P. Antin (ed.), *S. Hieronymi Presbiteri Opera*, Vol. 1: *Opera Exegetica*, Part 1, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 72 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1959), p. 139, 11-12.

⁹¹ D. Germanus Morin (ed.), *S. Hieronymi Presbiteri Tractatus sive Homiliae in Psalmos, in Marci Evangelium Aliaque Varia Argumenta*, Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina, 78 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1958), p. 464, 180-89.

⁹² Morrison, “Sources for the *Ormulum*,” p. 419.

⁹³ The *OED* 1989, s.v. *jolly*, adj. and adv.; and the *OED* 2000-, s.v. *gay*, adj., adv., and n.

⁹⁴ I have not included here ll. 4766 and 13349 (where the compound ME *wōwe* is recorded) because these lines seem to refer to MISFORTUNE (*HTOED*, 01.05.05.18.01.02, n.) rather than MISERY or MENTAL PAIN, SUFFERING. See the *MED*, s.v. *wō*, n., sense 2.a; and the *OED* 1989, s.v. *woe*, sense B.1.a.

⁹⁵ Solopova, “The Metre of the *Ormulum*,” p. 425.

⁹⁶ The *MED*, s.v. *wandreth*, sense b.

⁹⁷ ME *unselth* is recorded a number of times (ll. 1561, 1569, 1575, 2508, 2605, 4753, 4769, 4784, etc.), but it seems to refer to MISFORTUNE, CALAMITY (either in general or to specific examples thereof; *HTOED*, 01.05.05.18.01, n.), rather than to MISERY, UNHAPPINESS.

⁹⁸ The *HTOED* only lists ME *sīte* under 02.02.20, n., as a general reference to MENTAL PAIN, SUFFERING; however, its collocation with ME *sorwe* in its two occurrences and the facts that the *OED* 1989, s.v. *site*, n.¹, also provides a link to section 02.20.20.03, n. in the *HTOED*, and that the *MED*, s.v. *sīte*, n.1, sense a, interprets the term in the *Ormulum* contexts as meaning ‘a feeling of anguish, grief, acute anxiety; regret, remorse’ suggest that the narrower meaning might also be appropriate.

⁹⁹ Cp. ME *sorwen* in ll. 1278 and 8950, and *sorweful* in ll. 4789, 4805, 7153 and 8945.

¹⁰⁰ The *MED*, s.v. *sīte*.

¹⁰¹ Olszewska, “Alliterative Phrases in the *Ormulum*: Some Norse Parallels,” p. 127.

¹⁰² The *MED*, s.v. *cāre*, n.1, sense a.

¹⁰³ Sara M. Pons-Sanz, *The Language of Early English Literature: From Caedmon to Milton*, Perspectives on the English Language (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), pp. 9-10.

¹⁰⁴ ME *angren* is not listed in section 02.02.20.01, vt., of the *HTOED*. However, the description that we find in the *OED* 1989, s.v. *anger*, v., of the *HTOED*’s semantic category that ME *angren* is associated with, viz. “the mind » emotion of feeling » cause of mental pain or suffering » cause

mental pain or suffering to” and the list of its near-synonyms suggest that it should be included there. Caroline Gevaert, “The History of ANGER: The Lexical Field of ANGER from Old to Early Modern English” (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Leuven, 2007), p. 99, includes ME *angren* in the *Ormulum* in the lexico-semantic subfield of ANGER (see below, 3.2.3) rather than MENTAL PAIN, SUFFERING, the former being a common meaning of the term in early Middle English texts. This association is not beyond doubt, though, and, therefore, it has not been followed here.

¹⁰⁵ The spelling of the verb here is <swennkenn>, which might indicate confusion with ME *swinken* ‘to engage in physical labour, work hard’. See the *MED*, s.v. *swinken*.

¹⁰⁶ The *MED*, s.v. *baiten*.

¹⁰⁷ Hans Sauer, *Theodulfi Capitula in England: die altenglische Übersetzung, zusammen mit dem lateinischen Text*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur englischen Philologie (Munich: Fink, 1978), p. 365, ll. 28-29.

¹⁰⁸ On some occasions, it seems to mean HATRED or ENMITY rather than ANGER, a meaning that would associate the noun with the terms recorded by the *HTOED* in 02.02.23.05, n. (see below, 3.2.4). For instance, ME *nīth* and *wratthe* in ll. 123-24 (see below) seem to refer to L *querella* ‘complaint, accusation’ in Luke 1:6. It is not always easy to separate these meanings, though.

¹⁰⁹ The *MED*, s.v. *lōth*, n., sense 2.a; and below, 3.2.4.

¹¹⁰ “7 Godess wrapþe 7 wræche” (‘and God’s wrath and retribution’) is added in l. 9768 to expand the sense and associations of L *ira*. Translations from the Bible are based on (but do not follow *verbatim*) the King James Version, available at The Bible Gateway (<<https://www.biblegateway.com>>), accessed on 23/10/2014.

¹¹¹ L. 1233, where the noun appears with the alliterative ME *brak* ‘sound’, has not been taken into consideration because the noun should be associated there with VIOLENT ACTION OR OPERATION (*HTOED*, 01.05.05.20.03); see the *MED*, s.v. *bratthe*, sense a.

-
- ¹¹² The *MED*, s.vv. *grimmelezzc* and *grimmcunndlezzc*. See also above, I.1.b in section 2.
- ¹¹³ The *MED*, s.v. *bratthe*, sense c; and the *OED* 1989, *brath*, n.
- ¹¹⁴ Morrison, “Orm’s English Sources” and “A Reminiscence of Wulfstan in the Twelfth Century.”
- ¹¹⁵ Cp., as well, ll. 4456-65 with Ælfric’s translation of *De Duodecim Abusivis*, particularly ll. 162-67; ME *bratthe* seems to have been used there instead of OE *grama* ‘anger, rage’. For the Ælfrician text, see R. Morris (ed.), *Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries: First Series*, vol. 1, EETS, o.s. 29 (London: Oxford University Press, 1868), pp. 296-304.
- ¹¹⁶ Peter Clemoes (ed.), *Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies: The First Series, Text*, EETS, s.s. 17 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 314, ll. 44-47.
- ¹¹⁷ Dorothy Bethurum (ed.), *The Homilies of Wulfstan* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), p. 249, ll. 114-19.
- ¹¹⁸ Orm might have been playing with the more common collocation of ME *grille* and *grim* (see the *MED*, s.v. *grille*, sense 1.a); this collocation, though, is only attested once in the *Ormulum* (l. 9881).
- ¹¹⁹ *Ormulum*, II, 378.
- ¹²⁰ The *MED*, s.v. *brōth*, senses 2.a and 2.b. For an overview of the lexico-semantic subfield of ANGER from the Old to the Early Modern English period, see Gevaert, “The History of ANGER”. Rolf Bremmer, “Looking Back at Anger: Wrath in Anglo-Saxon England,” Toller Lecture (University of Manchester, 2010), focused on the Old English period.
- ¹²¹ On the possible association of ME *wratthe* with the words discussed in this section, see above, note 108.
- ¹²² Burchfield, “The Language and Orthography of the *Ormulum* MS,” p. 72, n. 3. Cp. the presence of ME *dafterleik* ‘modesty’ and *kaggerlezc* ‘wantonness’ in ll. 2187-88; Orm had also used both of them before he made a decision on how to handle the native and Norse-derived suffixes.

¹²³ Orm also uses the variant ME *doughtīnesse* (l. 17582); this noun is not otherwise recorded until the fourteenth century (see the *MED*, s.v. *doughtīnesse*).

¹²⁴ Cp. the original juxtaposition of ME *dafteleik* and *kaggerlezc* (see note 122), and ME *mōdizlezc* and *grēdīleik*.

¹²⁵ Sara M. Pons-Sanz, “The Etymology of the Word-Field of Old English *hōre* and the Lexico-Cultural Climate of Eleventh-Century England,” *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 55 (2011), 31-32.

¹²⁶ The *MED*, s.v. *mēk*.

¹²⁷ The *MED*, s.v. *mīlde*, adj.

¹²⁸ The *MED*, s.v. *mīlde*, adj., sense 2.a; the *OED*, 2000-, s.v. *meek*, adj. and n., sense 2.a.

¹²⁹ Olszewska, E. S. “Alliterative Phrases in the *Ormulum*: Some Norse Parallels,” p. 126; the *MED*, s.vv. *mēk* and *mīlde*, adj.

¹³⁰ ME *dafte* ‘gentle, modest, humble’ (ll. 2175 and 4610, where it appears with ME *mēk*), *dafteleik* ‘modesty, humility’ (l. 2188) and *daftelike* ‘properly, modestly, humbly’ (ll. 1215, 1232, 10000 and 15921) are also recorded in the text. However, even though the *HTOED* (02.02.29) associates them with the subfield of HUMILITY, they seem to refer instead to MODESTY, particularly in terms of MORALITY (cp. *HTOED*, 03.05.04.05.01.01) rather than EMOTION (cp. *HTOED*, 02.02.29.04). See also above, note 122.

¹³¹ Cp. ll. 9206 and 9604, where these two verbs are coordinated in a reference to flattening a hill.

¹³² That ME *eie* might have also referred to AWE, or a feeling mixing FEAR and RESPECT, in Orm’s idiolect is suggested by ME *eielēs* ‘irreverent’ in l. 6191; see the *HTOED*, 02.01.18.03.01, adj.

¹³³ The *MED*, s.v. *aue*, sense 3.b.

¹³⁴ The *OED* 1989, s.v. *for*, prefix¹.

¹³⁵ Alliteration (note the close proximity of ME *frōvren* ‘to comfort’) might have also facilitated the presence of a member of the ME *fēren* word-field instead of ME *fordrēd* in both contexts.